

6-2014

KALAMAZOO REVISITED: HERITAGE LANGUAGE MAINTENANCE AMONG LATVIANS IN NORTH AMERICA

Margaret J. Stepe

California State University - San Bernardino, margaret.stepe@gmail.com

Follow this and additional works at: <http://scholarworks.lib.csusb.edu/etd>

Recommended Citation

Stepe, Margaret J., "KALAMAZOO REVISITED: HERITAGE LANGUAGE MAINTENANCE AMONG LATVIANS IN NORTH AMERICA" (2014). *Electronic Theses, Projects, and Dissertations*. Paper 82.

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Office of Graduate Studies at CSUSB ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses, Projects, and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of CSUSB ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@csusb.edu.

KALAMAZOO REVISITED: HERITAGE LANGUAGE MAINTENANCE
AMONG LATVIANS IN NORTH AMERICA

A Thesis
Presented to the
Faculty of
California State University,
San Bernardino

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts
in
English Composition:
Applied Linguistics and Teaching English as a Second Language

by
Margaret Joy Stepe
June 2014

KALAMAZOO REVISITED: HERITAGE LANGUAGE MAINTENANCE
AMONG LATVIANS IN NORTH AMERICA

A Thesis
Presented to the
Faculty of
California State University,
San Bernardino

by
Margaret Joy Stepe

June 2014

Approved by:

Caroline Vickers, Committee Chair, Applied Linguistics

Parastou Feizzaringham, Committee Member

© 2014 Margaret Joy Stepe

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this paper is to investigate the entwined roles of schooling, family support and investment, and community contact in Heritage Language Learning (HLL), Heritage Language Maintenance (HLM) and identity formation among two groups of North American Latvians. One is made up of 49 teenagers at Gārezers language camp in Kalamazoo, Michigan. The other comprises 25 parents, other adult Latvian speakers and camp staff members. I explore differences and similarities among them by age, gender and self-stated national identity and language proficiency. Primary data consist of some 70 questionnaires completed by youths and adults and six 30- to 90-minute interviews conducted and transcribed by me. Six more were conducted via e-mail. Based on aggregate analysis of multiple-choice and short-answer questions, supplemented by participants' individual responses to longer-form survey questions and to my questions during interviews, findings demonstrate a connection between self-stated national identity (Latvian, Latvian-American or Latvian-Canadian, or American or Latvian) and self-assessment of Latvian language proficiency among the youths. Among the adults, men were more likely to identify simply as Latvian than were women, and adults of both genders who identified as Latvian averaged slightly lower in self-assessment of proficiency, even though most of them grew up speaking Latvian at home. Additionally, my research shows a community proud of its HLM accomplishments alongside those of displaced peoples from other nations—a community now at home in North

America, although 60 years ago members were determined to return to Latvia.

Keywords: L2, Latvian heritage language revitalization, third space, lingua franca, language immersion, heritage language maintenance.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am grateful to the staff, parents, and campers at Latvian Gārzers Camp, summer 2011, for their hospitality and enthusiastic willingness to participate in my research. I also appreciate countless other members of the North American Latvian community who have encouraged me and added to my understanding.

I thank California State University, San Bernardino, professors Dr. Caroline Vickers and Dr. Parastou Feizzaringham, who guided my paper and shared their expertise in performing and presenting research. I appreciate Dr. Mary Boland, also of CSUSB, in whose class, English 609, “Perspectives on Research,” the idea for this project sprang suddenly into existence. Without her enthusiasm and encouragement, I might not have taken my notion—to write about North American Latvians’ heritage language maintenance—to the next phase.

I am deeply grateful to my mother, Dr. Janice Kollitz, who has modeled courage and diligence throughout her life. As her daughter, I never questioned that a woman should pursue her life’s desires at any age. And I thank the rest of my family: my husband Uldis, post-World War II Latvian immigrant and lifetime enthusiast and teacher of his culture and language; our three grown children—Māra, Brita, and Āris—North American-born speakers of Latvian; and my two brothers, Richard and John. I appreciate all the ways my family inspires me.

One last, but never least, acknowledgement goes to my dear friend, co-conspirator, cheerleader, and occasional editor, Laurie Williams.

DEDICATION

This paper is for my late parents-in-law,

Leo F.A. Stepe and Brigita Ilona Rozitis Stepe.

They were never far from my thoughts during this project.

Ar mīlestību, cieņu un apbrīnu maniem mīļajiem vīra vecākiem.

Outdoors in early-morning Michigan mist, nearly rain, I watch a few dozen teens trudge up a grassy hill, around and around to the top, where they muscle up two flags by rope; the flag of the United States, hoisted high, sways lightly just above the maroon and white stripes that signify Latvia, their faraway symbolic homeland, the place their grandparents left in anguish and in hope, the distant dream that was never again to be their physical home.

I stand among these people. Taller than I, fairer than I. A different people, a different language, a group to which I do not belong but solemnly appreciate at this moment. I sense their longing and sorrow, gratitude for their adopted homeland and reverence for their forebears. Some of those grandparents stand near me now, people whose homes and land were taken from them, and who started over in a new place, leaving behind family they would never see again.

The teens clasp hands as they lift their voices, their faces so earnest.

Daugav' Abas Malas: the two sides of the river—or both shores—are not divided; the guardian will decide. They invoke God to protect their land at home, to protect them.

Looking around, I discreetly survey the welling tears of women and men,

older and younger, and become conscious of a lump in my own throat—though I cannot personally connect these sentiments with anything in my life experience.

(Personal reflection, M.J.S.)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	iii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	v
DEDICATION	vi
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION	1
Historical Context	3
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW.....	11
Other Heritage Language Groups	12
CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY	
Background	29
CHAPTER FOUR: FINDINGS	
Participant Identity and Affective Factors by Group.....	37
CHAPTER FIVE: CONCLUSION.....	80
APPENDIX A: TABLES	83
APPENDIX B: INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL.....	95
APPENDIX C: LETTER FROM CAMP DIRECTOR	97
APPENDIX D: CONSENT FORMS	99
APPENDIX E: QUESTIONNAIRE	104
APPENDIX F: INTERVIEW	114
APPENDIX G: CAMP FLYER.....	117
REFERENCES	119

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Immigration often leads to language shift and loss across succeeding generations. (Bradshaw 2006, Guardado 2011, Oriyama 2010, Sanders 1979, Stafecka 2009) and language is an important identifier of many aspects of human life, such as social status, education, and national and cultural membership (Guardado 2011, Messing 2007, Pavlenko 2005). Depending on population numbers and concentration, as well as social and group acceptance among native and other residents of the new region, immigrant groups will be more or less inclined to maintain their home language and pass it along to their descendants (Alba 2002, Bradshaw 2006, Dressler 2010, Guardado 2011, Moderessi 2001, Norton 2000, Octu 2011, Oriyama 2010, Park 2007, Pavlenko 2005, Schwartz 2008, Stafecka 2009, Woods 1999).

Scholarship abounds around HLL and HLM (Messing 2007, Hornberger 2006, Alba 2002, Bradshaw 2006, Norton 2000, etc.) and cultural attitudes and identity issues (Messing 2007, Hornberger 2006, Pavlenko 2005), but there is a gap when it comes to heritage language maintenance within displaced communities. The dearth of HLL scholarship is especially striking in the North American Latvian community; this group strongly valorizes study and academic achievement (Sanders 1979) and maintains a coordinated system of camps and schools dedicated to maintaining the language and culture of its homeland. The

last in-depth look at its methods seems to have been Sanders' study. I am taking another look, based on my primary research during summer 2011 at the Latvian language camp near Kalamazoo, Michigan. My investigation explores North American Latvians as maintainers and revitalizers of their language and examines their attitudes toward HLL and HLM. One important question is how language attitudes relate to national identity; this community's nation of origin is dramatically changed from the way they remember it, and they have long been citizens of Canada or the United States.

North Americans of Latvian heritage are keeping their mother tongue and its culture alive in a diaspora that began decades ago and now comprises as many as five generations of families. Tightly organized and connected by federations of camps, schools and churches (Sanders 1979, Meija 2005), Latvians in the United States and Canada have also kept their music, arts and literature vital "in exile," although—or perhaps because—for most, Sanders (1979) says, going back to live in the ancestral homeland is no longer an active goal. Cultural preservation methods include summer camps where children and teens are immersed in the Latvian language. They sing and dance to Latvian folk tunes, eat traditional Latvian foods and create art using Latvian techniques and symbols. They are encouraged to speak only Latvian at camp. Many in the current generation attending these camps identify as Latvian rather than American or Canadian, and my research indicates that they do so to a greater extent than do their parents and/or grandparents.

Historical Context

Latvia's long experience of rule from outside may offer some perspective on why its refugees were—and, in many cases, remain—so determined to maintain their identity as a people even as members of other immigrant ethnic groups assimilated into United States and Canadian culture. Latvians' common birthright comprises their language and traditions and their respect for learning and literacy. Despite refugees' steadfast loyalty to language, arts and culture rooted in millennia of history, the term "Latvians" lacked both ethnolinguistic and political relevance until the nineteenth century, according to Andrejs Plakans, author of *The Latvians: A Short History* (1995). Without the stability of its own internal government, the territory that is now Latvia was ruled across the centuries by a series of invaders, including, Plakans writes, "Vikings, Russians, Teutonic knights, Poles and Swedes until the eighteenth century, when the Baltic region, including Latvia, came under Russian rule and remained thus subjugated until the end of the First World War" (p. xiii).

Life was harsh for the common folk, peasants and serfs under the feudal yoke of both German barons and Russian tsars. Especially influential were the land-owning Germans who established themselves in the Baltic provinces and held onto their status as gentry until the advent of the first Latvian state after the 1917 Bolshevik revolution, Plakans (1995) writes.

The oppression hindered, but did not prevent, the development of a Latvian literature, learning, media, and economic development. Baltic

industry and urban centers grew, especially Riga, and Latvian towns became increasingly more Latvian and less German in character. The Baltic region became a window to Europe and was influenced culturally and socially by both Russia and Europe (p. xiv).

In the 1560s and 1570s, according to the Latvian Institute's "History of Latvia: A Timeline," Latvia became a bone of contention among Danish and Polish-Lithuanian forces and the armies of Russian Tsar Ivan the Terrible. In 1583, Polish-Lithuanian King Sigismund II claimed the territory west of the Daugava, granting broad privileges to the German gentry there. In 1621, the armies of King Gustavus Adolphus conquered Riga, ringing in what are now called "the Swedish times," or even—because that king and his successors reined in the Germans—"the good Swedish times" (Institute).

Although the Roman Catholic Church facilitated many early incursions into the region, including establishment of the German barons, the influence of Protestant reformer Martin Luther swept up the barons and most of the region's population. The Roman Catholic and Lutheran catechisms were the first books printed in the Latvian language, in 1585 and 1586, respectively. Most in the region were Lutherans by the middle of the seventeenth century (Institute). The Reformation's effect on the lives of the largest plurality of the population, the peasantry, is hard to describe, Plakans writes.

Sources are silent on the pace and the extent to which congregations in the countryside "became Lutheran." The peasants of Livonia certainly did

not initiate their own conversion; this step, when it happened, was taken by local landowners who “led” their peasants into the new faith. What role conviction played among peasants is therefore difficult to say.

Luther’s insistence on teaching the Scriptures in parishioners’ native languages—as opposed to Roman Catholics’ reliance on Latin for everyone—gave clerics in Latvia incentive to learn the language of their flocks, and to translate Bible passages into Latvian (Plakans). In *A History of the Baltic States* (2010), Andres Kasekamp writes that the spread of the Protestant Reformation in Latvia—and with it, literacy—was facilitated by the invention of the printing press. “A fundamental tenet of Protestantism was that people should be able to read the word of God themselves” (p. 40).

Published in 1688-1694 was a Latvian-language Bible, translated by Father Ernst Glik of the Aluksne Lutheran parish. It influenced Latvians’ literacy for centuries (Institute). Another cultural benchmark was German-Latvian writer Christoph Fürecker’s 1685 Latvian hymnal, Plakans writes, which provided Latvian lyrics to be sung to the melodies of German hymns.

Fürecker’s translations used Latvian idioms, proverbs, and metaphors to reduce the distance between the German-dominated Lutheran Church and its Latvian parishioners. Fürecker was more than a translator in that many of his hymns departed so far from the originals that they can be thought of as original poetry in Latvian (p. 57).

National Awakening

Reading and writing skills became more and more common as the new publishing industry thrived, writes Plakans, although at first almost all content printed in Latvian was produced by German writers. Even so, the Latvians' oral tradition remained strong: "Folk songs (*dainas*), stories, legends, riddles, sayings, and a host of other expressions saturated peasant celebrations" (p. 58).

Despite ongoing fighting over Latvia's territory in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, arts and culture continued to develop in what the Latvian Institute calls "the national awakening." Riga's first theatrical performances were staged, and national festivals for folk songs and dancing emerged. By the beginning of the twentieth century, many Latvian writers had established themselves as poets and novelists.

At the same time, the twentieth century redoubled the turmoil over who would rule Latvia (Institute). In 1905, educated Latvians and the Latvian Social Democratic Workers Party joined Russian workers and farmers in a revolution against both the government of Tsar Nicholas II and Latvia's own landed German gentry. As a response to revolutionists' burning of German mansions in the Latvian countryside, the Tsar sent punishment squads to execute Latvian insurgents; hundreds were killed, and thousands fled in the first of several waves of refugees to leave Latvia as revolution and war shook the region—and the rest of the world—over the next several decades (Institute).

In 1918, with Germany the loser in World War I and the new Soviet Union beleaguered by Tsarist resistance, Latvia declared its independence (Institute). The new nation enjoyed a period of self-rule, educational and cultural growth, and varying degrees of representative democracy (Kasekamp, 2010). That ended in 1940, when Soviet troops again occupied Latvia, renaming it the Latvian Soviet Socialist Republic, and integrating it into the apparatus of the USSR (Institute).

During World War II, Nazi Germany occupied Latvia, pushing the Soviet Union east. Some 200,000 Latvians died in the fighting—some against the Germans and some against the Soviet Union. Others, 50,000 Jews and Roma, were victims of the Nazi Holocaust (Institute). The Soviet Union moved back into Latvia as the Nazis lost the war, and 150,000 Latvians fled to Germany, Great Britain and Scandinavia. They lived in displaced persons camps, many of them for several years, awaiting opportunities to emigrate and build new lives. In the meantime, food and drinkable water were scarce, and disease and fear were everywhere.

A Woman in Amber

In the memoir *A Woman in Amber*, Agate Nesaule writes of her struggle to find herself as an adult in the United States in the wake of a harrowing childhood in Latvia and Germany during and after World War II. Memories of violence, occupation, oppression and hunger resound in her later life, even as she gets her education and finds success as a professor at the University of Wisconsin

(Nesaule, 1995). Her family's experiences with German occupiers, Russian overlords and the trauma of being uprooted from its homeland are held in common with thousands of Latvian families who relocated to the United States, Canada, Australia and elsewhere in the 1940s and 1950s. They were determined not to forget Latvia, and to keep its heritage and language alive in their children and grandchildren.

Amber—chunky, fossilized ancient tree resin—is found mainly on the beach and in coastal forests along the Baltic Sea, according to Nancy P.S. Hopp, author of *Amber: Jewelry, Art and Science* (2009). It sometimes shows visible inclusions of seeds, leaves, insects and other relics of the natural world. Dark yellow, translucent and hard to the touch, amber is easily shaped using heat, and Latvians prize it for jewelry-making. Amber was one of the region's first commercial products, and has been exported for centuries (Hopp, 2009, p. 14).

Nesaule's memoir places her "in amber" for much of her life, frozen in time by her trauma. That metaphor might be extended to include whole communities of immigrant Latvians who—even as they languished in European displaced-persons camps—set up means of retaining their language and traditional ways. Nesaule's personal vision of a life in amber emphasizes hunger and isolation from her homeland, but she and other participants in the Latvian Diaspora after World War II also found ways to preserve cultural and linguistic resources that let their children and grandchildren experience the Latvian life they had to leave behind.

Nesaule writes of her schooling in the camps. School was a reliable anchor for the children of war, and parents were eager to help them catch up with studies they had missed and to get them ready for the future.

Most Latvians in the camps were well-educated professionals who taught what they knew. Choirs, plays, gymnastics, book discussions, chess tournaments, lectures and crafts classes took place constantly. Children watched volleyball, basketball and soccer games. We were taken on nature hikes and told stories as we sat by campfires. Girls were taught to darn and hem, to knit Latvian mittens with intricate patterns, to embroider pillow covers with tiny cross-stitches in traditional designs (p. 121).

Nesaule's family eventually emigrated to the United States—although to her parents, she writes, it was not so much emigration as extended exile. They longed for Latvia, and looked forward to a time when their homeland would be free of the Soviet Union—a time when they could go back to stay. Similarly exiled Latvians settled in enclaves around the United States and Canada, in New York, Michigan, Toronto, Indiana, California and elsewhere. They made it a top priority to set up weekend schools and summer camps for the Latvian education of their children. By now, three generations of Latvian Americans have spent weekends and summers learning Latvian history, culture, arts, and especially language.

The Latvian Language

The Latvian language (also sometimes called Lettish) lies alongside its close relative, Lithuanian, on the East Baltic branch of the Baltic limb of the Balto-Slavic language hierarchy (Millward, 1996). Latvian is largely on the Satem side of the Satem/Centum isogloss of the Proto-Indo-European family tree, according to Mallory (1997): In Latvian, the labials of PIE's labiovelars merge into the dorso-velars, with distinct dorso-palatals. Mallory hears Centum influence in some words, however: I wonder if that relationship might be a legacy of Latvian's many German loan words; Latvia was ruled for centuries by an ethnically German upper class.

About 1.9 million people speak Latvian, 1.2 million of them as their first language, according to *Ethnologue: Languages of the World*, a website that offers statistics for 7,105 languages and their dialects in its 2013 edition. Most live in Latvia, where about 80 percent of the population speaks the language. Latvian speakers outside of Latvia, 100,000 to 200,000 of them, comprise the Latvian Diaspora, people who have left Latvia over the past 60 to 70 years, including my North American Latvians and their descendents and other populations in Australasia, Scandinavia, Europe and elsewhere. Written in Latin script, the Latvian alphabet (latviešu alfabēts) has 33 letters, 22 from the Latin alphabet and 11 based on Latin letters using diacritical marks.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

In her 1979 exploration of the status of Latvian Americans' cultural and heritage language maintenance to that point, Zinta Sanders provides much historical information about diaspora Latvians, and excellent background for my study. Many/most Latvians who were able to leave Latvia during World War II did so—via stays in European displaced-persons camps, sometimes for several years. Adults in the camps set up makeshift schools that mirrored primary and secondary institutions in Latvia. Families who made it to the United States believed their exile would be temporary, and that it was important for them to keep their language and culture alive so their children would not fall behind and would fit in once they were back at home. They received great acceptance and assistance from religious institutions in the United States; they used church sanctuaries and space for community centers, enjoyed tax-exempt status, and were accepted into American synods. (Most Latvians are Lutherans, but some are Catholic. A few others were accepted as Baptists, and some by non-denominational churches.)

Religion and religious instruction of children were always highly valued in Latvian culture, as was secular education—but previously these functions were separate. Now it was more efficient for the Latvians to cover everything in one place, so churches housed supplementary school, and provided space for

learning and performing folk songs and folk dances. This enterprise was highly successful and North American Latvian children of the 1950s through 1970s were well-immersed. Sanders (1979) eerily predicted there might never be a Latvia again—or, at least, not the Latvia these people knew and tried to preserve. The subjects of my study are mostly the children and grandchildren of these immigrants, and one can trace current Latvian supplementary school curriculum and camp programs to these early days. In fact, even the report card format can be traced to schools in Latvia prior to World War II.

Other Heritage Language Groups

HL maintenance programs similar to those created by North American Latvians help Japanese-Australians maintain the language of their ancestors. Kaya Oriyama (2010) studied the roles of school and community contact in identity construction by surveying Japanese-English bilingual parents and youths in Sydney. Oriyama found that community schools supported positive Japanese identity, hybrid identity and Japanese maintenance. Oriyama writes about HL revitalization “in an increasingly globalized world where rising numbers of mobile citizens live outside their home countries, and the world’s major cities are becoming more multilingual and multicultural” (p. 95).

North American Latvians have commonalities with other displaced groups (Alba 2002, Bradshaw 2006, Norton 2000, Oriyama 2010, etc.) but most of those look to their homelands for standard usage; these Latvians do not, necessarily, although the camp at which I did my research now makes a practice of recruiting

Latvians from Latvia to augment its homegrown language teaching forces. My study looks at how Latvian-American parents report their willingness to make substantial investments of time, effort and money to teach children their heritage language. Theorist Bonny Norton, in her 2000 HLL study in Canada, looks at immigrant mothers' attitudes toward maintaining children's home languages, following five women through six months of learning English. One mother, Katarina, fears losing intimacy with her daughter; Polish is the language of her heart, and the language she wants to speak with her child. "Thus the Polish language meant more to Katarina than a link to the past," Norton writes. "It was an essential link to her future; her ongoing relationship with her daughter and her identity as a mother" (p. 89). I see this as relevant to the North American Latvians' drive to keep their children fluent. They reify an expatriate version of Latvia that doesn't exist except in their communication (Sanders 1979). If their children don't speak the language, they won't live in the same "country."

Other Diaspora Latvians

Although Sanders' 1979 work is the most recent scholarship regarding heritage language maintenance among North American Latvians, Anya Victoria Woods' (1999) look at HLM in the Latvian community in Melbourne, Australia, offers a range of findings relevant to the current study, and her conclusions resonate with ideas and experience reported by those whom I interviewed and surveyed.

Woods uses Polish Australian theorist Smolicz's "cultural core value theory" as a basis for her analysis of the Melbourne Latvians' motivations for maintaining their language. Her research showed that being able to speak, read and write in Latvian were of primary importance to participants in maintaining the Latvian culture in Australia. Participants were students, teachers and parents involved with a state-supported weekend Latvian language program. Woods (1999) explores core-value factors in several areas of Latvian Australian culture, but her findings about HLM, via Smolicz, seem quite congruent with my research.

Smolicz's cultural core value theory examines factors at the heart of a group's culture, even standing as symbols of the group and its membership. Under this theory, group members who reject core values are moving themselves away from the community; if rejection of core values becomes common, the group disintegrates. Smolicz theorizes that groups for which HLM is a core value—Australian examples given are Latvians, Greeks, Poles and Chinese—tend to maintain their languages longer as minority groups within a larger society. Woods mentions Dutch immigrants as a group that has not prioritized its language and has seen a high rate of language shift in Australia.

Woods adapts Smolicz's methodology for identifying cultural core values in order to explore Latvian Australians' attitudes toward HLM, asking participants to rate the importance of 15 cultural factors relevant to the distinctiveness of the Latvian culture in Australia. Surveys placed speaking, reading and writing in Latvian as the top priorities. Participants responding to open-ended questions

indicated that it would be difficult to be a “true” Latvian without language skills. Woods also found, however, that speaking Latvian in daily life was not as high a priority for participants. Most indicated that they spoke “some” Latvian at home, but the amount was linked to generation: Grandparents spoke it most, followed by parents to children. Children and youth—although they ranked language skills as highly as their parents did—reported speaking more Latvian with their grandparents than with their parents, and nearly always spoke English with their siblings and contemporaries.

Woods asks, then: Why do Latvian Australians give such a high priority to HLM? It is apparently not just about speaking the language in the family and local community. She writes that her findings suggest an international focus for Latvian speakers: preservation of the worldwide Latvian community that emerged in the Latvian Diaspora after World War II. After the war, most of those who fled lost ties with their homeland, but maintained contact with other groups of Latvians around the world. Remaining fluent in Latvian allows them to maintain the ethnic connection that has sustained them for decades. They remain a united people, even though separated geographically.

Latvians in Siberia

Russian and Soviet authorities sent more than a million people, among them thousands of Latvians, to Siberian labor camps and gulags from the nineteenth century through the Stalin era, often to slow deaths of cold, starvation and disease. Theorist Anna Stafecka (2007) makes three research trips to

Siberia—1991, 2004, and 2006—and analyzes the Latvian language skills of Siberians of Latvian descent. She looks at Latvian language maintenance among generations, making note of age, level of education, religion, and connection to family in Latvia. Stafecka assesses current skills and frequency of language use among multiple generations, and makes predictions for future viability of the language there. She observes participants from Siberian villages where Latvians are the ethnic majority and those where Latvians are outnumbered by other groups, and discusses language attitudes among speakers. Stafecka provides a neat and straightforward characterization of the language itself.

The Latvian language, a member of the Indo-European family of languages, and one of two surviving Baltic languages, is the native tongue of approximately 1.5 million people, primarily in Latvia, although dispersion of Latvian speakers in the world is rather extensive. The Latvian language has developed historically under the influence of various social, political, and economic processes, including emigration from Latvia (p. 102).

As her project participants are in Siberia, Stafecka provides a history of the movement of Latvians into Russian areas over the past 200 years, from banished peasants, political offenders and other exiled persons of the early nineteenth century to voluntary colonizers throughout that century and into the twentieth, to those impacted by World War I and the Russian Revolution who fled Latvia in droves, to the more recent and very storied hundreds of thousands shipped to Siberia under Stalin in the 1930s, '40s, and '50s. Important to history,

Stafecka points out, are infamous periods wherein two social categories of 1930s Latvians were deeply, tragically, impacted. Collectivization—which was the way of the Soviet Union—destroyed a way of life, “anihilat[ing] the agrarian, cultural, and religious foundations of Latvian farmers, and repressions, which destroyed the most educated segment of the population” (p. 105). For all intents and purposes, Latvian cultural life shut down immediately. The educated were “repressed”—killed. This included intellectual classes, business owners, and the doers of society. Many others were shipped to Siberia. My own father-in-law escaped Latvia on a tugboat to Denmark in 1938, never to return. During this period Siberia experienced a significant influx of Latvians.

Over time, those who survived settled in communities that were either already heavily Latvian, or more integrated with other groups. Stafecka looks at both during her three excursions, the first in 1991. She reports distinct Latvian ethnic identity remaining strong, even among those who have less—or no—Latvian language. Strongly linked to Latvian identity in Siberia are religion, literature, and music—very much like North American Latvians. Stafecka reports that many in the ethnic Latvian communities look down on parents who do not pass the language and culture to younger generations and also notes that the Latvian spoken in these Siberian villages has changed, so that speakers claim not always to understand Latvians in Latvia—the degree to which the language shift has occurred more among these villages than the language in Latvia itself is not addressed.

Identity and Emotion

Affective factors have a significant influence on immigrants' determination to maintain their languages in new lands. Theorist Aneta Pavlenko (2005) looks at complexities of HLL and multilingualism in terms of identity, attitudes, and affective factors in language selection, exploring ways in which emotion guides speakers' language choices. She writes, for example, about a Jewish 19-year-old who escapes the Nazis in 1939 and comes to the United States determined to uphold the beauty of the German language against Nazi "deformations" (p. 192). I see a similar issue for Latvians in North America; they have kept their language largely free of Russifications that exist in the homeland itself (Meija 2005, Sanders 1979, Stafecka 2009).

How does a language learner take the first steps to actual speech? How do people change in relation to new languages? How can a language student use the past to inform the future? Those are questions theorist Bonny Norton (2000) asks in *Identity and Language Learning: Gender, Ethnicity and Educational Change*. Issues of power relations between language learners and target language speakers have a big effect on second language acquisition and acculturation. Norton believes that conversation in the target language is necessary for second-language acquisition, and that some conversations are more helpful than others. Particularly, she says, conversation in the natural or informal environment of the target language community is more helpful than that of the formal classroom environment. Language learners respond to and create

opportunities to speak their target languages, she says, and the lengths to which they are willing to go correspond to their investment in the process and in their own transforming identities. A similar idea lies at the heart of the Garjezers camp experience, and I had many opportunities to ask campers, parents and camp staff how the language immersion environment affects their HLL experience.

Revitalization

In two Tlaxcalan communities where both Spanish and Mexicano are spoken, Jacqueline Messing (2007) explores the borders between different language ideologies' perspectives on public and private spheres. Spanish dominates business and the larger community while Mexicano is spoken—to a dwindling extent—in the home and among family and intimate friends. Messing explores possibilities for revitalization of Mexicano, but sees many obstacles—including Mexicano speakers' resistance to having their private home language taught in public. She tries to make a case for the schools' status as community fixtures run and attended by local people, and therefore in some sense private, but seems to conclude that revitalization will not be successful if imposed by the government; speakers of the language need to be involved. Although they are displaced rather than indigenous, the North American Latvians I write about share some characteristics with Messing's Mexicano speakers.

Messing's (2007) young subjects are almost a mirror image of my subject Latvian-heritage children. The latter, a self-selected group, choose to learn Latvian as the children or grandchildren of displaced persons, an ocean away

from their families' country of origin. This group wishes to maintain its identity in terms of nationality, roots awareness, and customs. Messing's and my subjects share a search for identity. Each group—the Mexicanos of Tlaxcala and the Latvians of North America—stands between two cultures. The Tlaxcalan children's willingness to speak Mexicano is mixed. In a way, at Latvian camp, the children are indigenous English speakers, and the larger (adult) society is trying to get them to speak Latvian: the world in microcosm, with the students as indigenous English speakers. The Mexicano speakers of Tlaxcala have for generations felt stigmatized and have tried to suppress this identity, but with revitalization efforts, new pride is being instilled in younger speakers.

According to Messing (p. 352), the Mexicano language revitalization efforts are carried out in three main modes: via supplemental material in local schools, though she calls this largely symbolic; more often through town cultural centers often called *casas de cultura*; and as "institutionally independent efforts." The cultural centers are most similar to the Latvian community centers seen in the United States and Canada: "Latviešu nams." Messing also identifies language organized revitalization camps, or workshops, under the program *Mahtitlatohcan Mexicano* (Let's speak in Mexicano) (p. 358).

Romaine (2006) asks whether, why and how to revitalize the 60 percent to 90 percent of the world's languages that may be headed for extinction within 100 years. She argues for preserving linguistic diversity by supporting minority languages that are showing signs of language shift: native speakers not passing

them on to their children, who typically speak the dominant tongue instead, and the languages being spoken in fewer societal domains. Unfortunately, she writes, it is much easier to identify ongoing language shift than it is to “determine the conditions [that] best support the survival and maintenance of linguistic diversity” (p. 442).

Prominent scholarship in language revitalization supports the idea of intergenerational transmission in the context of a stable diglossia: Families speak their mother tongue at home and in local communities while operating in the majority tongue in public-sphere transactions (p. 443). Romaine makes a distinction between diglossia and true bilingualism, in which both languages would be used in the public sphere, and notes that revitalization does not mean that the minority language reclaims lost domains or that its speakers drop the majority tongue (p. 444), a point she contends has been misunderstood: “For their part, however, many language activists do hark back to an imagined glorious past where their language was vibrant and they may long for the restoration of a society uninterrupted by another language and culture” (p. 446).

Role Models

Native speakers of a language are not necessarily the best models for those who are learning to speak it as an L2, writes Cook (1999), because no matter how hard L2 learners study, biodevelopmental factors keep them from relating to their new languages as if they had been born into them: “If students and teachers see L2 learning as a battle they are fated never to win, little wonder

they become dispirited and give up” (p. 204). Cook sees fundamental differences in language processing between people who speak one language, their L1, and those who speak both an L1 and an L2. Learning an L2, for example, has many effects on the learner’s L1. As an L2 learner adds language skills, L1 phonology and syntax move toward that of the L2; L1 word meanings also acquire shadings from the L2. Knowing two languages, Cook writes, gives the speaker more flexibility because he or she can often use strategies from the L1 in solving difficulties in the L2, and even vice versa (p. 192).

Many approaches to teaching seem to convey the message that the students should aim at L2 use that is unrelated to the L1, something that is virtually impossible to achieve and that denies their status as L2 users . . . the implication is that ideally the students would not be using their L1 . . . [u]se of the L1 is seen not as desirable but as a necessary evil (p. 202).

Instead, Cook contends, modeling the L2 user rather than the native speaker—and taking a cross-lingual approach to lessons—might be more effective than immersion as a strategy for language teaching, suggesting that it would make sense for language instructors to present L2 users in a positive light “rather than seeing them as failed native speakers” (p.185).

Intermediate Spaces

Canagarajah (2007) writes about Lingua Franca English, reframing the constructs of second-language acquisition to merge “performance strategies, purposive uses of the language, and interpersonal negotiations in fluid

communicative contexts,” calling for modification of previously dominant constructs such as “form, cognition, and the individual” to reflect hybrid characteristics in a way that offers broader ranges of interaction (p. 936). Other theorists have argued that SLA is an issue separate from that of communication, but Canagarajah contends that language acquisition is shaped by how people define community, language, and communication: The concepts are not divisible (p. 928).

[E]ven an ungrammatical usage or inappropriate word choice can be socially functional. They can create a new meaning originally unintended by the speaker, or they may be negotiated by the participants and given new meaning. Participants negotiate the language effectively to ascribe meaning to everything” (p. 929).

Canagarajah’s research into Lingua Franca English, which emerges to facilitate trade in settings where participants lack a common language, indicates that there is no form for LFE apart from actual practice. LFE—an expedient that evolves into a method of communication—does not reside in the mind of an individual speaker; rather, it is social action (p. 928).

Bhatt (2008) describes a linguistic third space between English and Hindi in the articles, editorials and advertisements of two English-language newspapers in India: “Whose *ghar ki kahaani* (household story) is this, anyway?” He argues that this code-switching “reflects a new socio-ideological

consciousness,” mediates between global identity and local practice, and provides a new way to express identity based on class (p. 177).

I define third space, especially in the context of post-colonial and (late-) modern India, as a theoretical construct to refer to a semiotic space between competing global collectives—e.g. colonized-colonizer, indigenous-foreign, local-global, traditional-modern . . . setting up new structures of socio-linguistic authority and new socio-political initiatives (p. 178).

Beyond recognizing the phenomenon of heteroglossia, which, Bhatt writes, has long been a fixture of Indian multilingualism, this code-mixing in newspaper journalism makes it possible to frame a new socio-ideological consciousness and create meaning in different ways: “Code-switching in newspapers, I therefore argue, offers one of the ways in which cultural texts participate in construction of wider cultural values and ideologies” (p. 182).

Personal Narrative

Interviews with parents and camp staff strongly influence my perspectives on Latvian HLL and the methods this group employs to transmit the culture of its ancestral homeland. I went into this project thinking of my interviews simply as tools for gathering information, but a number of theorists posit alternative functionality for interviewing, and looking back on my interactions, I agree that some of those ideas apply to my research.

Talmy (2010) makes distinctions between the interview as research instrument (examining “whats”) and the research interview as social practice (examining “whats” and “hows”), which pulls the researcher’s persona and ideology into meaning created during the research interaction: Interviewer and interviewee collaborate in the process of creating meaning, Talmy writes, questioning the implicit objectivity often attributed to interviews in applied linguistics. He calls for a new look at the manner in which interviews are theorized, and demonstrates how the research interview as social practice paradigm has manifested itself in his own work. Pavlenko (2007) sees aspects of aesthetics, accessibility and imagination as valuable features of autobiographical narrative and transcribed interviews: They are like stories, interesting to read; they appeal to a wide audience; and they let readers explore “alternative ways of being in the world.” Those attributes also complicate analysis, Pavlenko (2007) writes.

[R]egardless of what type of reality one is interested in, it is quite likely that the realities of subject, life, and text are not easily separable, and those interested in one aspect still need to be fully cognizant of the other two (p. 180).

Researchers must not approach narrative and interviews as they might their observation notes, she emphasizes; they are discourse, offering opportunities for linguistic, rhetorical and interactional analysis alongside their historical, political and social contexts.

Using interviews with a Hawaiian ESL student as examples, Talmy (2010) looks at ways in which he co-constructs meaning during an interactional event. For example, the interviewee, loane, uses the scornful expression “FOB,” which in local parlance means “fresh off the boat,” in this case denoting someone who, unlike her, might benefit from ESL classes. He writes that his very presence as a university researcher with an interest in ESL instruction likely predisposes loane to speak supportively of the course, although she has already said she does not need it. She sees him, Talmy writes, as challenging her opinion, and wanting her to explain herself.

loane’s eventual provision of this explanation, as well as her initial difficulties in forming it . . . her struggle with the original question . . . and her laugh “invitations” . . . indicate her orientation to the interactional context and to her interlocutor, and underscore the influence of both on the design of her answers. In other words, these are not simply “reports” of what loane feels or believes. Rather she displays an acute appreciation that she is negotiating some delicate and topical interactional terrain in this part of the interview, and she is not doing so with just anyone (p. 35).

A “what” analysis, Talmy writes, would likely overlook that aspect of the interview, but a social practice perspective reveals loane’s successful negotiation of a complex and sensitive exchange, and demonstrates that she is indeed an expert in her L2.

Pavlenko (2007) focuses on analysis of autobiographic narratives of bi- and multi-lingual speakers, looking at information gathered as subject reality, ways in which the language-learning process is experienced; life reality, or how the experiences were or are; and text reality, how the experiences are narrated. Lists of personal variables have been useful in content and thematic analysis tracking trends, patterns and concepts, she writes: "The key advantage of this approach is the sensitivity to recurrent motifs salient in participants' stories and thus to the themes that are important to L2 learners but may not have been reflected in previous scholarship."

On the other hand, we can also see that the factors listed reflect different areas of concern (attitudes, language learning strategies, social factors, etc.) and are of a different nature (external vs. internal) and different degree of generalization and abstraction (e.g. the spread of English in Iran vs. nesting patterns, that is, one's preference for comfortable surroundings.) Putting them together on a list may qualify as a preliminary analytical step, but not as analysis, because we are left with a multitude of questions: What exactly do these factors reflect? How are they linked to each other? How generalizable are they? (p. 166).

That is one of several weaknesses of content and thematic analyses, Pavlenko (2007) writes. Others are the lack of a theoretical perspective; absence of a process for matching instances and categories; overreliance on repeated instances; a focus on what is in the text without considering what may have been

excluded; and—Pavlenko writes that this may be the most important in terms of applied linguistics—insensitivity to the ways in which storytellers position themselves as different types of people. A not-very-useful list of observations, factors and categories is the result of going to work without a theoretical framework and a clear methodology, Pavlenko contends.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

Background

Many children of Latvian heritage living in Canada and the United States maintain their HL under the urging and at the financial expense of their parents, by attending Saturday or Sunday schools, usually at Latvian Centers attached to Latvian Evangelical Lutheran churches, and often by making the annual summer pilgrimage to various Latvian language camps (Sanders 1979, Meija 2005). These youths, and my study participants, maintain their language employing a variety of reinforcing strategies, including weekend schools, home HL use to varying degrees, social media and reading materials, films, and camp.

Unlike many HL groups around the world, North American Latvians do not have a public day school alternative; Latvian is not offered as a foreign language option in Canadian and American high schools the way Spanish, French and German are, plus a few others offered regionally. Latvians rely on their tight communities and coordinated leadership to keep the programs they have functioning, and have been fairly successful at handing the reins to new generations over the past 50 years. (Sanders 1979, Meija 2005). Parents and students report a variety of motivations, both practical and emotional, for maintaining their HL, idiosyncratic as it may be.

I did my research at the Latvian Center and summer camp at Gaŗezers (long lake) Latvian Center. Gaŗezers, Inc. identifies itself as a nonprofit, shareholder-owned organization. Its mission statement is: “Gaŗezers prospers as a meeting place for Latvians of all ages, to raise and educate Latvian youth, to strengthen the Latvian language, culture and spiritual values, to promote the Latvian way of life and develop links with Latvia” (Gaŗezers).

Physical Setting, Gaŗezers

Driving up to the property, you know you’ve arrived when you spot the maroon and white sign—signifying Latvian flag colors—“Latvian Center Gaŗezers-Dievam un Latvijai” (For God and Latvia.) Gaŗezers Summer Camp, founded in 1965, is situated on 169 acres of lush Michigan property. The name Gaŗezers has also become synonymous with the camp organization and camp site, but actually refers to the whole Latvian-owned site. The spot is ideal for many reasons: Its beautiful and tranquil setting provide plenty of room and opportunity for sports and other outdoor activities, including folk dancing and other performances in the amphitheater, and it is also centrally located to many of the larger pockets of Latvian population, within driving distance of Midwestern cities including Kalamazoo, Chicago, Detroit, Grand Rapids, Indianapolis, Cleveland, and Milwaukee. Attendees also travel from Boston, Toronto, and New York hubs. The website identifies the site’s amenities, and it seems to have everything needed for a summer gathering: a beautiful beachfront, lush woods, facilities, camps, library, workshops, an art gallery, museums “and more.” There

is a beautiful outdoor chapel, where each Sunday a visiting Lutheran minister leads a worship service, and this site is also popular for weddings and confirmations.

There are other camps, such as one in the Catskill Mountains of New York and one in Washington State. But for high school students, my research subjects, Gaŗezers is considered the main camp—the big one, and students come from faraway spots like California, Texas, and even Europe.

Surrounding the property is “Ciems Latvijā” (Latvian Village), a retirement community for older Latvians. The website refers to more than 120 homes and cottages on and around Long Lake, owned by Latvians, and there are many who visit in summer, parking motor homes or pitching tents right along the lake. These activities go on all summer and are not specifically related to the summer camp or its attendees and activities.

Every summer Gaŗezers runs four children’s programs which include a day care and summer school for three age groups: elementary school, middle school, and high school. The middle and high school programs offer more academic subjects and language immersion, while the elementary and day care programs are more strictly camp-like. The website claims that more than 300 children participate in these programs annually, and they offer “Latvian language immersion, cultural studies, sports and activities.” But over the course of a typical summer, more than 2,000 people visit the center. There are scheduled concerts,

art exhibits, a big annual soccer tournament, and various outdoor church ceremonies.

Staff and Students

The high school camp focuses on language, cultural activities such as Latvian art forms including ceramics, glass, jewelry-making, and more; folk dancing and folk singing. Those who teach and counsel Gaŗezers campers come from a variety of backgrounds. All are fluent in Latvian. Many are teachers by profession; others are artists and artisans who help campers learn traditional Latvian arts. Teachers are selected from a pool of highly fluent adults in the Latvian community, mostly Latvian-Americans and Latvian-Canadians. Most are themselves graduates of Gaŗezers summer programs. They are not necessarily teachers by profession, but several of them are. Historically, the camp staff and faculty were first-generation or early immigrants (World War II and post-World War II era) and this is still mostly true. All the teachers I met have bachelor's degrees at a minimum, but alongside any academic accomplishments they have, their passion for the Latvian language and culture is their most important qualification.

Some on the staff are not employees, but teaching professionals from Latvia who summer in Michigan as guests of Gaŗezers, said Andŗela, a camp administrator:

[T]hey all have J-1 visas and are considered Cultural and Educational Exchange Visitors. They are not only teachers, but also counselors. Their

visas actually say 'counselor,' so I guess I'd call them teachers/

counselors. It is important to note that they are not employees, but visitors from overseas (personal communication, June 2011).

Other staffers are Latvian immigrants to the United States since 1991, when the Soviet Union dissolved and Latvians were allowed to leave the country; they are also native speakers of the language.

Teachers generally return summer after summer, teaching fundamentals of grammar and vocabulary, and covering Latvian literature at all levels. There are other required courses, such as geography, history, and religion. Students are graded on a 1-5 scoring system, and are grouped according to age and somewhat by ability. There is talk of having a program for children of Latvian heritage who do not have language at home, as they come to camp with a different skill level. The discussion is ongoing, and all my participants offered opinions on this topic. The sentiment toward total immersion being best seems to be a value held by many, and yet some adults are calling for a relaxed policy to allow more children to participate and still feel connected, learn the culture and history and enjoy the camaraderie.

The high school program is not cheap—the parents pay \$2,500 for a five-week program, which does not include transportation to and from the facility. Scholarships/partial stipends are available for families who apply based on financial need. Students range from 14 to 17 years of age. Many, as seen in my

data, have been traveling to Gargezers every summer since they were Kindergartners, and have advanced through each level up to high school.

A Pattern to Follow

While browsing through stacks of linguistics journals in class a few years ago, I happened upon a 2010 study of Japanese heritage language learners by Kaya Oriyama of Victoria University in Wellington. The survey was laid out very well, and participants' responses reminded me of conversations in my own family. My husband is Latvian and deeply involved in maintaining the language and culture, and our children all speak the language and have participated in language programs from the time they were small. It occurred to me that this was exactly the kind of study I wanted to do, looking beyond my own family's experience to see how identity formation dynamics played out in the broader North American Latvian community. I used Oriyama's methodology as a model for my own, in part because her use of survey and interview seemed suitable for my goals, which were similar to hers: I wanted to hear about people's relationships with their heritage language in their own words.

Procedures

Individual and socio-psychological data such as family and educational background, language use and environment, identity, beliefs and language proficiency were collected through individual interviews from some participants, and surveys from most participants. My findings are based on 70 surveys filled out by campers, parents and other adults during check-in weekend at Gargezers

in 2011. With camp administrators' permission, I set up a table at registration and invited campers, parents and staffers to fill out surveys. Respondents were 49 youths: 27 male and 22 female, ages 15 to 18 (average age 16.3); 21 adults: nine male and 12 female, ages 45 to 87 (average age 54.7). Seven participants were from Canada and the rest were mainly from the Midwestern and Northeastern United States, with one family from Texas.

Participants filled out the surveys (See Appendix E) before or after their interviews (if applicable), which were conducted by me in English and last from 30 to 90 minutes. Six of the 12 adult interviews were conducted in person, digitally recorded and transcribed for later analysis; six were conducted via e-mail. Participants' level of Latvian proficiency and literacy were self-assessed on the surveys, and information was collected about Latvian media use.

To allow for the possibility that factors other than schooling and community contact might also affect identity formation and Latvian HL maintenance, the data on backgrounds, family, and language use were also analyzed, and the participants were compared in terms of identity and Latvian language proficiency to examine the effect of schooling and community on these variables. While age, gender, and length of schooling at Latvian School were comparable across the people in my study, only individual comparisons were possible for the effects of home language use due to a wide variety of variation in patterns of language use.

Privacy

To protect my participants' privacy, I have changed all names for this report. I assigned each participant a numerical identifier, and then applied a Latvian first name to each.

CHAPTER FOUR

FINDINGS

Participant Identity and Affective Factors by Group

I asked participants how they identify themselves—as Latvian; as Latvian American or Latvian Canadian; or as American or Canadian? Do they have Latvian surnames and/or given names? Do they like their names? Do they ask others to pronounce their names correctly? What percentage of their friends know they are Latvian?

I included participants' estimates of their own Latvian language proficiency hoping to see whether there is a correlation between Latvian self-identity and self-evaluation of language proficiency. The numbers seem to indicate such a correlation among the youths, but not among the adults. (See tables 2 and 2A.) That may be because the adults, average age 54.7, some born in Latvia and others born in North America shortly after their parents' arrival here, grew up steeped in Latvian language and culture. They spoke Latvian as their first language, learning English in school. Notwithstanding to what extent they later assimilated into English-speaking culture—or how they now identify—they never felt like newcomers to their HL, much like the English-learning mothers in Norton's (2000) study of immigrants to Canada, who continued to identify with their L1s even as they achieved proficiency in an L2.

Of the adults in my study, nine of the 21 (42 percent, five male and four female) identify as Latvian, and 12 (58 percent, four male and eight female) identify as Latvian American or Latvian Canadian. (None describe themselves as American or Canadian.) It is a small sample, but I thought it was interesting that more than half of the men identify as Latvian, compared with a third of the women. I think that reflects differences in the upbringing of girls and boys that go back to when these families were still in Latvia, and also later in the displaced persons camps. Nesaule, author of “A Woman in Amber,” writes about Latvia in the 1940s as a place where men occupied the leading roles in the public sphere, which is where demonstrations of patriotism and nationalistic fidelity take place, and women wielded their influence at home. The DP camps followed the same pattern, with boys learning trades and girls learning needlework and gardening and other home arts (p. 112). Where male/female roles diverge so markedly along public-sphere/private sphere lines, it doesn’t surprise me that a higher percentage of men would identify simply as Latvian.

That pattern holds among the youths: 21 of the 49 (42 percent, 13 boys and eight girls) identify as Latvian, 25 (51 percent, 13 boys and 12 girls) identify as Latvian American or Latvian Canadian, and three (6 percent, two girls and one boy, identify as American or Canadian. In this group, 49 percent of the boys and 36 percent of the girls identify as Latvian.

In terms of identity, 42 percent of survey participants—the same percentage among youths and adults—identify as Latvian, but the generations

differ in the proportions of each gender doing so, with a larger proportion of male adults identifying as Latvian, and a larger proportion of female youths identifying as Latvian American or Latvian Canadian—even allowing for the three youths, two of them female, who do not choose either category. (See Tables 1B and 6 for information on self-reported identity.)

Of the nine adults who identify as Latvian, all have Latvian first names and last names. All but two (77 percent) report liking their names. The two who report not liking their names are female. Six of the nine (66 percent) report that they do not insist that friends pronounce their names correctly.

Of the 21 youths who identify as Latvian, all have Latvian first names and 20 have Latvian surnames. Seventeen (81 percent) report liking their names. The four who do not report liking their names are male. Eleven of the 21 (52 percent) report that they do not insist that friends pronounce their names correctly.

Of the 12 adults who identify as Latvian American or Latvian Canadian, nine have Latvian first names and 11 have Latvian surnames. All report liking their names. Half report asking friends to pronounce their names correctly.

Of the 28 youths who identify as Latvian American or Latvian Canadian, 26 (93 percent) have Latvian first names and 23 (82 percent) have Latvian surnames. Twenty-five (89 percent) report liking their names. Of those who did not report liking their names, two were male and one was female. Nineteen of the 28 (68 percent) report that they ask their friends to pronounce their names

correctly. (Please see Table 2A for information about affective factors about names.)

I included the questions about subjects' names because I see names as central to people's identity: After first visual impressions, names are how others begin to know us. Some who have Latvian names do not seem to appreciate them—they see them as weird or unusual, and downplay their importance by accepting mispronunciations. Identity develops as we become aware of the ways in which we are like others around us, writes Oriyama (2010), and also in our understanding of the ways in which we differ from them. In deciding whether to insist on correct pronunciation of their names—which can, indeed, be hard for mainstream friends and neighbors to get their mouths around—my North American Latvian participants reveal attitudes about how important it is to them that others acknowledge and respect their cultural identities. Complicating the meanings of those attitudes, of course, is that some people are more invested than others in the importance of others' perceptions of them. Oriyama (p. 77) writes that identity can be inconsistent and situational, and context influences personal relations and communications. Other people's opinions are important, but identity blossoms in acceptance, resistance and negotiation related to ideas we have about ourselves.

What does it mean when someone named Mārtiņš—which would be reasonably correctly pronounced *Mar-tinsh*—lets English-speaking friends call him Martin? Perhaps it means that he doesn't mind feeling like part of the

mainstream crowd—he is, after all, an American or Canadian citizen rubbing elbows every day with people named Bobby, Connor and Jennifer, whose names everyone already knows how to say, and which require no diacritical marks. If, on the other hand, he insists that his friends make a sincere general effort to pronounce his name, he might seem to be saying, “I am different from your perception of me, and I don’t want you to forget it.” In fact, I think that is the message, although in my experience it doesn’t come from a feeling of superiority. Rather, when children get that strong imperative from parents and grandparents—“You are Latvian”—they feel a need to validate that with others: “Yes, this is who I am. I am here, but I am from there.” Oriyama says HL speakers’ identities are manifested in the ways they use the language, and with whom: “For bilingual speakers of a minority HL and a majority language, language use reflects their need and desire to identify with both, or part of each, linguistic community” (p. 78).

Their Hearts’ Home

Several interview subjects had emotional responses when I asked them about the meaning of the song I write about in the dedication of this paper. Both elegiac strain and solid unifier, *Daugav’ Abas Malas* varies slightly in meaning to different generations.

Arnis, 61: “Absolutely, it was a mantra for those estranged from their homeland . . . Its relevance has deeper impact culturally . . . relative to centuries of foreign invasion” (personal communication, June 2011).

Kaija, 24: “No, it’s more like both sides of the river, all parts of Latvia, cannot be divided. Doesn’t seem to refer to Diaspora to me” (personal communication, June 2011).

Camp administrator Andžela, 55: “I guess I have to agree with everyone—the song can be interpreted to have many meanings. I actually translated it for my camping session that doesn't speak Latvian.”

Daugava's both shores,
Forever united:
There's Kurzeme, there's Vidzeme,
There's Latgale ours.
Ai-rai, ai ri-di-rai-ra,
There's Kurzeme, there's Vidzeme,
There's Latgale ours.
Lady Luck, preside over us,
Protect our nation!
One tongue, one soul,
One land ours.

Andžela explains:

Kurzeme, Vidzeme and Latgale are the equivalent of states here. I think before Latvia gained its freedom in 1918 the symbolism was that even though we are not a country, we are a nation. I'd guess it had the same

meaning during Soviet occupation. Meanwhile on this side of the ocean the second verse probably was the one that people felt united the émigrés with those who stayed behind (personal communication, June 2011).

Lara, 72, adds her perspective:

During the 1950s, *Daugav' Abas Malas* became very much like a statement of longing to re-pledge allegiance to Latvia. A reminder that friends and family were on the other side. Neither Daugava (river) nor the ocean could separate us. There was only one Land, one tongue, one essence and it was ours, on both sides of the ocean. To this day this song can bring up the leaky eye syndrome (personal communication, June 2011).

Kaija responds:

It looks like the older generations took more out of it than I did. The song always made me feel sad and solemn, but I always sang it thinking of Latvia being torn up by war, not about my being forced to stay away. That sort of feeling is less relevant for my generation, being Americans. But it makes us sad about our grandparents' generation, I think (personal communication, June 2011).

Although I went into my research phase thinking of interviews as simple information-gathering tools, while reading over my transcriptions I noticed myself

co-constructing meaning, Talmy-style, while talking with Mārtiņš¹. One of the oldest of my interviewees, Mārtiņš shied away from emotional talk, preferring to focus on the “whats” in his experience, and sticking with the topic of Latvians in North America. Here is an excerpt from our conversation, and it illustrates how my questions, and even my word choices, may have affected his responses.

1. Margaret: Before I shut this off, I want to ask you . . . (a lawnmower starts up outside) I hope I can hear you. At the flag ceremony yesterday morning I was particularly moved by watching the flags raised?
2. Mārtiņš: Mm-hmm.
3. Margaret: I was surprised—I should have brought a tissue. I was so moved, I thought it was so beautiful. What can you say about that, the raising of the flags?
4. Mārtiņš: Well, the raising of the flags and the Latvian anthem, which we sing at the beginning of the week of school and on Saturdays, still brings moisture to my eyes, after all these 77 years I’ve lived, you know. It still does something. It does to a lot of us.
5. Margaret: I’m an American and I was wiping away a tear. All those beautiful young people, circling around . . .
6. Mārtiņš: Yeah, yeah . . .

¹ All participants’ names used in this thesis are pseudonyms.

7. Margaret: And the statement of having the American flag as well as the Latvian, if I'm reading it right, it's saying, "We're Latvian," but also showing deference and respect—
8. Mārtiņš: Respect for the country.
9. Margaret: So beautiful.
10. Mārtiņš: Yeah.
11. Margaret: I live in a place—and I mean no disrespect to that culture, either—but I will see the Mexican flag raised and not the American flag raised. It seems a little funny. But I try to imagine, maybe someone else's point of view. I mean, I don't know what it's like to be anybody but myself. But because the numbers are so high—we have so many Latinos in Southern California—that maybe it doesn't feel the same way to them. It doesn't feel so special. They're not a tiny minority. But yet they're in California, they're not in Mexico. I don't know.
12. Mārtiņš: They have a different tradition, probably.
13. Margaret: That's what I'm saying. It's like that. It's so beautiful (personal communication, June 2011).

In turn 4, I seem to be pushing Mārtiņš to respond in a way that would reveal his emotions, and he comes through, talking about getting teary-eyed, but he really doesn't want to go there. In turn 11, I may be hoping to get Mārtiņš to make a judgment, and maybe valorize Latvians as opposed to the Mexican

groups that I had characterized as not seeming to respect both flags—but he refuses to do so. My response is to backpedal, perhaps to avoid the appearance of having judged another group myself.

Revitalization

For the purposes of this paper, I am looking at the North American Latvian community as a minority language group struggling against a majority tongue that threatens to overwhelm it, along the lines of Romaine (2006), even though in this case the minority language “colonized” that of the majority. The North American Latvians began their revitalization effort as a strategy for returning to their homeland intact in language and culture, able to pick up where they left off. Decades later, when most could go back but few have, the goal itself seems to have shifted: Latvian speakers are preserving their language in an effort to retain the bonds of a community outside Latvia. They have created their own diglossia, *à la* Romaine (2006): They pursue intergenerational transmission of the language by means of speaking it in the home (to greater or lesser extents) and also by providing schools and camps for enrichment.

Proficiency Self-rankings and Identity

Of the adults, 14 (66 percent) give themselves the highest rating, a 4, in Latvian proficiency, 4 being most proficient, 1 being least. Four of them identify as Latvian, and 10 as Latvian American or Latvian Canadian. Six give themselves a 3: two who identify as Latvian and four who identify as Latvian

American or Latvian Canadian. The self-ranking of one adult participant who identified as Latvian was 2.

The average self-ranking of the Latvian-identified group is 3.5, while the average among those who identify as Latvian Americans or Latvian Canadians is 3.6.

Of the 21 adults surveyed, 12 said that if asked, they identify themselves as Latvian-American or Latvian-Canadian, while nine claim the answer is always “Latvian.” A few of my interviewees said their answer depends on who is asking, and where they are.

Of the youths, 17 (35 percent) give themselves a 4 in Latvian proficiency, 10 identifying as Latvian, six identifying as Latvian American or Latvian Canadian, and one identifying as American or Canadian. Thirty (61 percent) give themselves a 3, 11 identifying as Latvian, 18 identifying as Latvian American or Latvian Canadian, and one identifying as American or Canadian. Two (4 percent) give themselves a 2, one identifying as Latvian American or Latvian Canadian, and one identifying as American or Canadian.

The average self-ranking of the Latvian-identified youths is 3.47; the average among those who identify as Latvian American or Latvian Canadian is 3.2; and the average among those who identify as American or Canadian is 3. The differences among the three youth identity groups are larger than those among the adults, and—based on statistical analysis—I think that may be significant; it seems plausible that those who give more emphasis to their Latvian

heritage would value their language proficiency more highly than those with less investment in being Latvian. Woods (1999) found something similar among the Australian Latvians she studied: Maintenance of language and culture both remained core values among her three groups of participants, but she found that over time—and especially since Latvian independence—her respondents valued “Latvian customs and celebrations” more highly than they did “Love of the Latvian homeland.” For Woods’ research subjects and for my participants, their status as Latvians and participation in demonstrations of that identity through cultural events and traditional celebrations and activities correlate with the amount of pride they take in their language skills, and possibly with the amount of effort they are willing to invest in maintaining them.

Immersion: Should camp be a Latvian-language-only environment?

Most of the youths responding to my survey either heartily approved of or didn’t object to the camp’s focus on speaking in Latvian only, both in classrooms and during activities and free time. Staff members acknowledge, however, that in practice campers often speak English among themselves. Staffers and other adults I surveyed or interviewed also addressed a growing controversy in the Latvian community: Is it helpful—both in camp and in the larger community—to focus on immersion in Latvian, giving a thorough linguistic and cultural experience to fewer people with each generation? Or would it be better to focus less on fluent speech and more on culture, opening the experience to more people who might otherwise drift away from their Latvian heritage?

The North American Latvians I surveyed and interviewed have cherished the idea of immersion—teaching Latvian in an all-Latvian context—for many years, but as succeeding generations have bonded with English and many families speak less Latvian at home, the idea of a cross-lingual approach to lessons as described by Cook (1999) has found advocates, including Gaŗezers teachers like Maruta².

I do speak—use English words in my classes to translate sometimes, because I know there’s like a specific Latvian word, and we can talk around it and around it in Latvian, but sometimes it’s easier to say, like, hey, that word (gud)? That means “soul,” like “you’ve got soul.” You need to know in order to talk about what we’re talking about (personal communication, June 2011).

Andŗela, a camp staffer, sees language immersion as a necessity for campers, and their fluency, in turn, as preservation for the wider Latvian community. She said she boosts Latvian all day, every day camp is in session. She encourages campers’ efforts and emphasizes interest and fun in camp programs. She wants Gaŗezers to be a place where kids get to speak Latvian, rather than a place where they have to speak it.

[T]he first day of camp. I say, “You know, I know some of you guys speak Latvian at home, I know some of you don’t . . . and I always try to relate it to myself, too. I say, “You know what? I live in a place where there aren’t a

² All participants’ names used in this thesis are pseudonyms.

lot of Latvians, either, and it's hard, those first couple of days, maybe, it's hard to speak Latvian all the time." I say, "You know, guys, keep on trying, keep on trying, and it'll go!"

She said she has found that it takes about three days to get campers in the habit.

The first three days, it's more and more pace: "Speak Latvian, speak Latvian, speak Latvian!" And after a while, you say, "Look! That little group over there, they're speaking Latvian amongst themselves." And they do speak English amongst themselves—I don't kid myself that they speak Latvian all the time, but we do see a change. . . . So I think it really helps, because, again, it's a total immersion situation (personal communication, June 2011).

Without the ability to speak Latvian, said Mārtiņš, who came to the United States as an 18-year-old in the early 1950s, how could Gārzers campers maintain more than a passing interest in the culture anyway? "Without the language you know zero about what happens here," he said. "You can't participate. You don't have the thoughts. You don't have the ideas of what Latvia's all about" (personal communication, June 2011).

It's a hard question, said parent Lūcija³. One side wants to speak only Latvian and not "dumb down" the curriculum—which, she said, probably does help campers achieve more. The other side sees the community losing a large

³ All participants' names used in this thesis are pseudonyms.

cohort of people who are not willing to invest that much time and effort, and “who feel left out – and that’s a bad thing.”

You lose a lot. Yeah, people might argue that you retain others . . . with stronger language, but I personally don’t think that’s the way to go. I mean, we’re not living in—if you want to speak completely, totally, 100 percent Latvian, you can now go to Latvia. You can be that, you can live there; you can get a job there. If you’re here, and you want to have some kind of connection with your past, you have to involve people who are not 100 percent Latvian, who have one American and one Latvian parent. Who have, you know, one Latvian parent who doesn’t speak very well (personal communication, June 2011).

Maruta sees a need for some accommodation to campers who lack language skills. Currently, she said, “the focus is on language, and the reason the focus is there is because, every year, you just hear that it gets harder and harder for the kids to communicate effectively in Latvian.”

[T]he goal of this place was . . . you would come here and only speak Latvian, and only have classes in Latvian, and everybody would be, everyone was pretty much fluent. And you could understand it on a level that you could understand literature at home in English, whatever you’re doing in your home school. But just the further you get away from the first generations that came here, the harder it becomes to preserve the language (personal communication, June 2011).

She said there has been talk of grouping campers by language ability rather than by age, but she doesn't think that will happen: "[T]he social aspect of this place is just as important as the language . . . if I'm in a class with a 13-year-old and I'm 17, that's not what I want. That's not what my summer should look like" (personal communication, June 2011).

One of Maruta's close friends attended Garezers as a youngster, she said, but quit after two years in the high school program.

[I]t was just too hard for him. His Latvian was not good enough. He grew up speaking pretty well with his grandparents, but as he got older he didn't spend as much time with his grandparents . . . There wasn't enough support for someone who didn't speak Latvian well enough (personal communication, June 2011).

Maruta said the camp is looking for ways to deal with the reality that not as many families speak Latvian in the home now as did 50 years ago. When she walks by classrooms where campers are chatting together, she hears a lot of English. It's not so much because they don't want to speak Latvian, she thinks, but because many of them can't speak it well enough to have a meaningful conversation.

And I'm not trying to be pessimistic about it. I think it's reality. And I think the question is like, what do you want? Like, do you only want like the pure language spoken, or do you want to involve? It's like the difference between inclusion and exclusion. Do you want to involve as many people as possible in this endeavor, knowing then that the level of language

ability is going to go down, but the level of culture—interest in the culture, knowledge of it—you know, you’ll be able to keep it alive for bit? (personal communication, June 2011).

Ināra⁴, who teaches Latvian crafts courses, sees speaking Latvian as a vital part of preserving the culture. She speaks Latvian to her students, but uses English when she needs to: “I must admit I do say the word ‘grout.’ . . . I just—there’s more to life. I forget what grout is. So no, I do intersperse with English” (personal communication, June 2011). Still, Ināra said, being able to communicate in Latvian is important: Language and culture support each other. One of her family members who does not speak Latvian sometimes feels like an outsider at community events. The usual fix, Ināra said, is for others to break off their Latvian conversations and speak English.

[I]f you’re at a table, as soon as there’s one person who’s not Latvian, then unfortunately, the majority of the time, it breaks down and it’s in English.

All it takes is one person. You know—and then yes, there is some Latvian going on, but it’s so much easier to fall into English (personal communication, June 2011).

Who are Native Speakers?

As I work with my data, a question keeps nagging at me: Who are native speakers, and who are HL learners, in the North American Latvian Community? Cook (1999) writes that “a person is a native speaker of the language learnt first,”

⁴ All participants’ names used in this thesis are pseudonyms.

(p. 187) and by that definition many of my research participants are native speakers of Latvian: The older generation's and many younger respondents' families spoke Latvian in the home, and they learned English when they went to school. For many of them, however, English has become the language they reach for first. Maruta, for example, says Latvian was spoken in her home as she was growing up, but her English is now better than her Latvian. She speaks Latvian with an American accent, she says. Cook's perspective is that accents or the perceived lack of them are not relevant to native-speaker status, but it seems to me that some of my research subjects are better described as bilinguals than as HL learners or revitalizers. My own children spoke Latvian with their father and English with me in equal doses when they were small, so under Cook's definition would qualify as native speakers of Latvian. They participated in Latvian school and camp, and as adults they are for all practical purposes English speakers who can also speak Latvian.

For North American Latvians, I think part of the distinction between "native speaker" and "HL learner" may lie in the relevance of the language to daily life. The older participants in my study grew up speaking Latvian because that was the language of their community. What else would they speak? They learned English when their families came here, but continued to speak Latvian at home and among themselves. The younger participants speak Latvian because their parents see the language as a link to family, culture and heritage. In the communities in which they live, however, English is the dominant tongue. Even

though their parents likely spoke Latvian to them in their cradles, English got to them on the playground and in the classroom, and it is the language at which they are most proficient.

Cook (1999) contends that the native speaker may not be the best model for teaching language, anyway: The achievements of proficient L2 users offer more realistic goals for people learning a language, he writes: “The ultimate attainment of L2 learning should be defined in terms of knowledge of the L2. There is no reason why the L2 component of multicompetence should be identical to the monolingual’s L1” (p. 191).

Intermediate Spaces

Latvian-English third spaces similar to the Hindi-English phenomenon described by Bhatt (2008) already exist in publications and on websites of North American Latvian organizations, despite those groups’ devotion to preserving Latvian language and culture in the face of what could be seen as English-language hegemony. Code-switching is common in the camp setting, too, as students out of class find their comfort levels with each others’ Latvian proficiency, adding English as needed to be understood in social interactions. It is easy to infer some of Bhatt’s “colonized-colonizer, indigenous-foreign, local-global, traditional-modern” duality here, but it’s interesting to think about which language is doing the colonizing in this setting. Who are the foreigners? Is it the students, some of them unsure of themselves in what is supposed to be an all-Latvian setting? Or is it the parents and teachers who see a future in which

younger generations—although aware of their Latvian heritage—identify more and more strongly with English?

“I would call it kitchen vocabulary,” says Gaŗezers staffer Ināra, explaining that for many North American Latvians the language has undergone some simplification. It is still useful as a lingua franca among members of the worldwide Latvian community, but the ways in which it is spoken vary widely.

Oh. Yeah. Some have wider—you know, if you read, if you’re a reader, then you have the language. But if you’re just listening to Mum and Dad and Grandma and Grandpa, some are stronger, but I would basically describe it as kitchen language. If one were to have a meaningful discussion, where you needed certain descriptive vocabulary, I would say it’s very limited (personal communication, June 2011).

Lingua Franca Latvian, much like the Lingua Franca English described by Canagarajah (2007), is an important connector, even though North American Latvians are monolithically fluent in English. Knowing enough to get by at Latvian community events—music and dance festivals, scout gatherings, etc.—helps participants feel as if they belong, Ināra says. When people stop feeling as if they are members of the group, she adds, the group falls apart.

You can know about (Latvian folk hero) Jānis, you can know about this, you can know that, but until you have some language, so that you can even sing along with a page with the words on it, you know, even half-

attempt it, you psychologically, in my opinion, feel like an outsider?

(personal communication, June 2011).

Heritage Language Maintenance—Youth Surveys

Many who responded to question 5 under “Language” in my survey—Why should/shouldn’t American Latvians and their descendents learn Latvian?—indicated that being able to speak Latvian is an important factor in keeping the culture alive. Since the Latvian culture is alive and well in Latvia, it stands to reason that the culture my participants seek to preserve includes Latvians outside Latvia.

Diaspora Latvians, including those I studied, tend to travel widely for school and camp and Latvian cultural events. Latvian choirs and dance groups for both youth and adults often draw members from different states and provinces, and attendance at international gatherings is common. The youths I surveyed had a lot to say about language and culture and maintaining a bond. Many have been together in Latvian school and camp since they were small children, and consider each other close friends even though their homes are far apart.

Māra⁵, 16, comments that learning Latvian “(keeps) the language/culture alive—it’s an important part of their ethnic heritage” (personal communication, June 2011).

⁵ All participants’ names used in this thesis are pseudonyms.

Brigita, 16, responds that “They definitely should because we need to keep our culture and language alive outside of Latvia” (personal communication, June 2011).

Kārlis, 15, writes that “American Latvians should learn Latvian because it is the language of their heritage, and it shows a bit of patriotism to know that you can speak the language” (personal communication, June 2011).

Katrīna, 17, writes that “They should because being Latvian is what I am most thankful for. It helps preserve the culture and gives a strong sense of identity and belonging” (personal communication, June 2011).

Jūlijs, 16, writes, “They should, because then they can keep our community alive. Latvians are a family and we have a special bond that is life long, and no one wants to lose” (personal communication, June 2011).

Laila, 17, writes, “We should learn Latvian because it is an amazing and unique language that should be preserved for many years to come” (personal communication, June 2011).

Ārija⁶, 16, writes that “the language is the backbone to the culture and traditions. *Tautas dainas* (folk songs) cannot be understood without the language” (personal communication, June 2011).

Jāzeps, 17, responds that learning Latvian helps people “remember their roots and heritage” (personal communication, June 2011).

⁶ All participants' names used in this thesis are pseudonyms.

Gatis, 17, writes that learning Latvian “introduces them to a whole different community, world view, and way of thinking” (personal communication, June 2011).

Miķelis, 16, writes, “They should, because Latvian is a dying language in the U.S.” (personal communication, June 2011).

Iveta, 15, writes that American Latvians should know the language “to keep the culture alive because otherwise the Latvian heritage will die out” (personal communication, June 2011).

Žubite, 16, characterizes Latvian as “a dying language,” writing that if no one (in the younger generations) continues to learn it “then the language will cease to exist” (personal communication, June 2011).

Diāna, 16, writes that “if descendents don’t know the history of their families that is sad and a large piece missing from their personality” (personal communication, June 2011).

Lize, 17, writes that “it is one of the best ways to keep the Latvian culture alive” (personal communication, June 2011).

Kronvaldis, 16, writes that American Latvians should “keep the tradition alive—without language we also don’t have the songs, literature nor the deep connection to other Latvians” (personal communication, June 2011).

Heritage Language Maintenance—Adult Surveys

The adults I surveyed also seemed to be looking to connections with other diaspora Latvians in their answers.

Rasma⁷, 53, writes “Latvian keeps you in touch with your roots, your culture, who you are. You feel like you belong to an extended family. You’re in touch with others who share your values: You feel pride in where you came from” (personal communication, June 2011).

Ivars, 53, writes that he grew up in a mostly Latvian environment. It was important to him to be able to communicate with his grandparents, who spoke only Latvian. “My children want to learn Latvian to speak their grandparents’ language. I still have cousins in Latvia, we keep in touch” (personal communication, June 2011).

Sarma, 48, writes:

If they have an interest in protecting the culture, heritage and language, they should learn and use Latvian. If they want to get together for beers and call themselves Latvian for no other reason, they shouldn’t. Don’t use the term if you can’t support it by “walking the talk” (personal communication, June 2011).

Like Woods’, my participants’ responses seem to reflect more devotion to the Latvian language itself and to the goal of preserving the culture than to the ideal of speaking Latvian in the home, although many Gārzers families do so routinely; in my interview with camp administrator Andžela, she talks about hearing parents and offspring speaking to each other in English at registration,

⁷ All participants’ names used in this thesis are pseudonyms.

and reports that it takes several days to get campers into the habit of speaking Latvian.

Bendiks⁸, a study participant and 87-year-old retired physician, adds his perspective:

All during my life in U.S.A. we have always spoken Latvian at home. All three of our children were proud of the example we—the parents—tried to set for them, by being good Americans, who did everything possible to maintain our Latvian language and heritage and add to it. I personally was the President of the Latvian Society in Oregon for 4 years, the President of the American West Coast Latvian Song festival Council for 18 years, organized two Latvian youth education camps, DIVREIZDIVI (capitalization his), was involved in many other Latvian activities such as purchasing property near Sheldon, WA, where we have had yearly Latvian summer school, “Kursa,” and Latvian children’s camp “Mežotne.” My wife and our children were very much involved and helped in many ways to make my efforts successful.

He continues:

All this and above was done to maintain the Latvian language and Latvian culture not only in our family but to involve the youth of Latvian parents and Latvians married to spouses of other nationalities. The Latvian

⁸ All participants’ names used in this thesis are pseudonyms.

government awarded me the honor of being the recipient as the Officer of THE THREE STAR MEDAL in 2003.

Bendiks sees the torch being passed to younger Latvians.

The number of the older patriotic, proud Latvians (born in Latvia) is gradually diminishing. Thus the job to continue their efforts in maintaining the Latvian language and the heritage has been proudly taken over by the men and women of Latvian parentage who were born away from Latvia. It is admirable that after these long years (since 1944!) there still are many people of Latvian descent who in United States and other countries, far away from Latvia, speak Latvian language and maintain our traditions and cherish the Latvian heritage.

He concludes:

The ORIGIN and the HEART of all these efforts is THE LATVIAN FAMILY! However Latvian schools, folk dance groups, choirs, song festivals, education camps etc., etc., play a great role in the success. We are fortunate to see and observe around us, that Latvian language and Latvians are active and proud in Latvia and also here in the U.S.A. (personal communication, June 2011).

Parents' Investment in Latvian Education

Mārtiņš, whose children all attended Gārzers, said he sees a big difference in results between families who emphasize Latvian at home and send their children to weekend language schools and camps, and other families where

the Latvian language takes a lower priority. Parents who make the investment in time and money have children who grow up to be Latvian speakers and generally stay involved with the community, he said. He has close friends, however, people who are themselves deeply involved with the community, whose children have not learned Latvian and have no interest in the language or the culture. It depends on the investments—time and money—families are willing to make

The wider Latvian community also makes substantial investments in children's language experience, he said. Programs such as *Sveiks Latvia* (Hello Latvia), which sends teenagers on summer visits to their families' homeland, are expensive, but Mārtiņš said they pay off later.

It's a tremendous program. I know I was so skeptical in the beginning when I heard about it, because the parents paid half and the American Latvian Association, I believe, paid the other half—quite a considerable sum for each kid. I said, "This is crazy, this spending money. Why? I mean, if you want to go to Latvia, go buy a ticket and fly" (personal communication, June 2011).

But after he served as a leader on one trip, he said, he understood the value of the community's investment. Meeting people in Latvia—sometimes relatives—and speaking their language with them intensifies travelers' connection with their roots, and makes both the language and the culture more real: "Why should you have any interest if you don't know the language? And the language brings

interest— interest in the culture, history, and everything” (personal communication, June 2011).

The time and effort that parents and the community invest in the younger generation’s Latvian experience pay off in strong bonds between the past and the future, Mārtiņš said.

I don’t know how you can measure this, because it all depends on their parents and how Latvianized they are, whether they have good background. Because we’re talking about what, third generation now? . . . Because some of those parents went through this school. . . . It just continues on. It goes from generation to generation. So they maintain the level, you know, and that is phenomenal in itself, for that many years. Because usually, in other groups, you hear . . . everything is slipping. But the Latvians are hanging in, you know (personal communication, June 2011).

Gaļina⁹, born in Latvia, said her in-laws, who fled Latvia in the 1950s, made sure their children spoke good Latvian; they had invested their hopes and energy in the idea that one day the family would return to live in Latvia. That didn’t happen, but Gaļina remains very conscious of a responsibility to speak in Latvian with her children. She remembers, as a child and young adult in then-Soviet Latvia, experiencing the Russification of her language and culture. Like other Garezers parents, she is eager to invest time and energy in her children’s

⁹ All participants’ names used in this thesis are pseudonyms.

familiarity with their family's language and heritage. Her family had visited Latvia five years before, she said, and planned to go again in a year.

I think the families from Garēzers see themselves as in some way connected to Latvia, but not as much as their parents. But they do see a thousand percent value of still educating their kids to speak Latvian. And I don't know any ethnic group in the United States so far whose ethnic descendents in third generation speak (the language of the old country) (personal communication, June 2011).

Travel is an important part of parents' investment in their children's Latvian education: not only travel to Latvia, but travel around the United States and Canada to participate in Latvian cultural activities such as music festivals and craft events. Many families log thousands of miles yearly to attend gatherings in far-off places. Often the trips require time off work, and children might typically miss school. Lūcija¹⁰, a Latvian Canadian, sees the time and financial investment as valuable in part because of the hardships her parents endured during World War II and in displaced persons camps after the war, and out of respect for the effort they invested in her Latvian education. Her family always spoke Latvian at home, she said, and she and her brothers had extra lessons on weekends: "[I]t wasn't an option as to whether you were going to go. You were going to go, your parents said. You were going to Latvian school."

¹⁰ All participants' names used in this thesis are pseudonyms.

You have to keep up your culture, because someday it will be free and you will go back and you will be able to speak the language. They can't keep up the culture in Latvia under the Russians, so we have to do it for them. And it was a very big load on our shoulders, I think, for the kids my age. Because you didn't have the option of not doing that, because otherwise your entire culture would be lost (personal communication, June 2011).

The family investment can be burdensome, Lūcija said, because kids don't learn to think in a language without being immersed in it. Saturday school isn't enough; most families need a place like Gaŗezers, she said, where they live in Latvian: "Camp is a great place to do it in, because it happens naturally . . . because you have them twenty-four/seven" (personal communication, June 2011). Nearly constant contact with a heritage language is a big sacrifice for children, Lūcija acknowledged, and it doesn't pay off in twenty-four/seven fun, necessarily. She didn't always enjoy Latvian school herself, and doesn't like making her children attend when they don't want to. For Lūcija's family, getting to school and events also means a lot of driving in frustrating big-city traffic, and she has other things she could do with her time. Still, she said, "If I power through and get them the basics, they can decide do they want to keep with it or they don't."

[A] lot of people give up. They say, "I can't do this anymore. I can't spend my weekends doing all this Latvian stuff – I want my kids to do sports." Or,

“I don’t have the language myself – it’s too hard to learn.” You know, I feel like I was very close to that point (personal communication, June 2011).

Another Latvian Canadian, Gaŗezers staff member Ināra, remembers her brothers fighting their parents over having to go to Saturday language school.

[W]e would do our Latvian homework in the morning, and then go from 12 o’clock to 5 o’clock in the afternoon to Latvian school. So it was a full day. My brothers always used to fight and scream and cry. It was a major battle . . . my brothers left by Grade 4 or so, because it was just too much of an uphill battle. So that’s my – having to go to Latvian school when all my Canadian friends were – you know, it was a weekend, it was playtime. . . . But I was an obedient daughter, so I went (personal communication, June 2011).

It takes patience and consistent effort to support maintenance of a heritage language, said camp staff member Andŗzela, who has two teenaged children. “It’s an uphill battle,” she said.

Because I see, even my own kids, we speak Latvian at home, but their language, they’re not as artic—I’m not saying even I’m perfect in Latvian, but they can’t express themselves as well as I can, and I can’t express myself as well as my parents can. . . . I’m always, like, “Speak to me in Latvian! Speak to me in Latvian! You can do it!” (personal communication, June 2011).

For many families, said camp staffer Maruta, a vital element of the heritage language investment is money: Latvian-speaking family members are very helpful, but “you have to have means, too.” A relative of hers, for example, always said, “My kids are going to speak Latvian no matter what.”

Well then, she marries an American guy, who is very supportive of it, but very limited in what he can offer, and (the relative) had to send the kid to day care, that’s the reality, and she hears him speaking English, and . . . she just decided that she can’t listen to that anymore, so they just – they had the means – they are bringing over an au pair from Latvia. She just said, “I cannot have my son speaking to me in English” (personal communication, June 2011).

Making the choice to lay the foundation is what keeps Latvian and other heritage languages going, Maruta said. There will always be families for whom it is paramount: “[T]hey’re going to find a way to make it happen, and they’re going to live in a place where there’s a Latvian culture around them” (personal communication, June 2011).

Supplemental Factors by Group

Participants’ self-evaluations of Latvian language proficiency, and factors in what each sees as his or her biggest challenge with the language.

Among the adults, 14 (66 percent, five male and 9 female) rate themselves at 4, the highest ranking. Four males and four females report that

vocabulary is their challenge; one male and four females choose grammar. One female does not list a challenge.

Six (28 percent, four male and two female) rate themselves at 3. One female and one male say vocabulary is their challenge; one female and three males choose grammar.

One female rates herself at 2, choosing grammar as her challenge.

Adults who rate their Latvian language skills at 4 are more likely to choose vocabulary as their biggest challenge than those who rate themselves at 3 or 2, most of whom choose grammar as their challenge.

The average age of adults who rate themselves at 4 is 46, quite a bit younger than 60, the average of those who rate themselves at 3 or 2. I wonder if participants whose Latvian educations began in European displaced persons camps had a significantly different experience from those educated after their families arrived in North America; that would be an interesting focus for future study.

Unlike the adults, the biggest group of youths (61 percent, 18 male and 12 female) rates itself at 3. Thirteen males and nine females choose grammar as their challenge; five males and three females choose vocabulary.

Of the 17 youths who rate themselves at 4 (32 percent, seven males and nine females) the largest plurality comprises six females who choose grammar as their challenge; two other females list vocabulary, one chooses spelling and

one does not state a challenge, while three males list vocabulary, three grammar and one spelling.

Females comprise 44 percent of the youth sample, but make up 52 percent of those who rate themselves at 4 in Latvian proficiency. The females in the 4 group are less likely than the males to choose vocabulary as their challenge.

Males comprise 55 percent of the youth sample, but make up 60 percent of those who rate themselves at 3 in Latvian proficiency. The males in the 3 group are slightly more likely to choose vocabulary as their biggest Latvian challenge.

These numbers, small as this sample is, seem to support the common idea that teenage girls feel more confident than their male counterparts in areas of language and vocabulary.

Identity and Heritage Language Maintenance

Latvians came into what many of them called exile in North America with a specific goal in mind: They were determined to maintain their Latvian language and identity so that when Latvia was eventually free—although surely damaged culturally by Soviet occupation—they could return and reseed their motherland. Unlike many immigrants, they hoped their children would remain distinctive. Although they learned English and participated in American and Canadian life, they also created networks of Latvians who taught, learned, socialized, worked

and played together. The participants in my study represent the results of that determination. Many identify simply as Latvian, with about the same number responding that they are Latvian American or Latvian Canadian. Just three describe themselves as American or Canadian.

For Gārzers staffer Andžela, Latvian identity is her life: “It’s . . . what I was, always. From Day 1, that I’m Latvian.”

And I actually think it is because our parents, they didn’t come to the United States freely, they didn’t come looking for a better life, they came as displaced persons. So for them it was different. They needed a place to live. Because of the war, they fled their country. They had lived under Communism . . . and they realized how bad it was. And they just said they could not live under Communist rule. So they fled—fled with the clothes on their backs. So I think that’s different than if you’ve come to a country looking for a better life. Or seeking gold, or something. So because of that, they raised us to be, you know, Latvians (personal communication, June 2011).

She said she thinks identity is more complicated for the younger generation, including current Gārzers campers; their lives plug into a wider society, and many don’t speak Latvian at home. Her own children tell her they see themselves as Latvian, but sometimes it’s hard to get them to speak the language.

Gaiņa, a Latvian-born Lutheran pastor on a visit to Gārzers, said she deals with identity issues frequently in her congregation. North American

Latvians have seen their dreams smashed several times over the past several decades, she said, starting in displaced persons camps after World War II. Many thought the United States or Great Britain would free Latvia after a few years, so they were satisfied to wait in the camps. While they waited, they set up schools, churches, arts and music programs, choirs, folk dancing, theater groups and sports clubs, Gaļina said, “with a goal to go back, you know, and educate their kids in language and culture. So when they go back they’ll know the language and everything about who they are.”

And that didn’t happen. So they came either over here, or any other country they were sponsored from in the world. And for 50 years they had very strong—how do you say it? Motivation to keep up the culture again. Language, culture, everything they knew, including food, with the thought that they’re gonna go back (personal communication, June 2011).

But when Latvia became independent in 1991 with the breakup of the Soviet Union, Gaļina said, very few people returned to Latvia.

For example, in my congregation, I know of only one couple, an older couple who went back, really, to live there. And they came back. Because they simply couldn’t cope with the tremendous change they saw, you know, from the Latvia they left, and the dream they had about Latvia. And now it was different (personal communication, June 2011).

So, Gaļina said, the North American Latvians buried their dreams—the hopes to which they had attached their very identities—again.

[W]e had this dream for 50 years. They were telling the world all the horrors they experienced during World War II and all the richness of the culture suppressed by the Communists, and they realized they are not gonna go back, because they did not have a goal anymore (personal communication, June 2011).

Galina said she sees this current Gaŗezers generation and their parents beginning to adjust their community and individual identities.

I think the families from Gaŗezers see themselves as in some way connected to Latvia, but not as much as their parents. But they do see a thousand percent value of still educating their kids to speak Latvian. And I don't know any ethnic group in the United States so far whose ethnic descendents in third generation speak (the language of the old country). . . . I think Latvians in general, as a nation; our ethnic identity is very strong, if we keep it up . . . [w]e have this natural instinct to rebel, I guess(personal communication, June 2011).

Mārtiņš, born in Latvia and brought to the United States as a teenager, has worked and volunteered at Gaŗezers for decades. He said he always identifies as Latvian, except when traveling in other countries. In Australia, for example, he got used to being seen as a Yank. A sports coach by trade, Mārtiņš worked in a large U.S. city and has lived much of his life speaking fluent English among non-Latvians, although he has always participated in Latvian cultural

activities. Now retired, he apologized for what he called his imperfect English: He had become re-Latvianized, he said.

I have very little exposure to English. I'm retired, so I don't have work colleagues anymore, I'm not coaching anymore . . . the way I did for a number of years, coaching American kids in soccer. So I'm very much back to Latvian, every day. . . . We speak Latvian at home, and the kids speak Latvian, and we get here, and we're just in Little Latvia—we call this Little Latvia (personal communication, June 2011).

Some in his circle have backed away from their families' strong Latvian identities, he said. They had negative experiences in Latvian language school and did not want to put their children through the process. One friend was angry about it, he said: "There must have been something that traumatized her, you know, people were picking on her or making fun of her accent, or something like this. And she said, 'My kids will not go through this.' " Consequently, he said, his friend's children do not speak Latvian and do not identify as Latvian.

Mārtiņš has a notion that his Latvian identity is programmed into him: "Because nobody told me I have to do this. I came with my parents here, and we could be Americans, you know, in a year" (personal communication, June 2011).

Lūcija, a Latvian Canadian, said her immigrant parents worked tirelessly to instill Latvian identity in their children. The family spoke Latvian at home—"You weren't supposed to speak English"—and she and her siblings all went to Latvian language school and summer camps. English, along with Canadian culture,

came into their home when the family got a TV set when she was 4, she said, and she was speaking English well by the time she finished first grade. Lūcija said she always felt a responsibility to be Latvian—and someday take Latvian culture back to her family's homeland. Now that Latvia is free, she said, and she is an adult, she no longer feels that responsibility. Canada is her home. People who want to be 100 percent Latvian can do that, she said: They can live in Latvia and work there and raise new generations. That is not the answer for her, she said.

If you're here, and you want to have some kind of connection with your past, you have to involve people who are not 100 percent Latvian, who have one American and one Latvian parent. Who have, you know, one Latvian parent who doesn't speak very well (personal communication, June 2011).

Quite a bit younger than other Gaŗezers employees and volunteers I interviewed, Maruta calls herself Latvian American. "I'll always say Latvian first, because I feel like I actively—that is what actively makes me different." Latvian was spoken in her home as she was growing up, but her English is now better than her Latvian, she said. A graduate of Gaŗezers, Maruta has pursued Latvian identity all her life, and she lived and worked in Latvia for a year after college. It is hard for her to think of herself as completely Latvian, however, because she communicates best in English.

One turning point for her, Maruta said, came when she was a child in 1991, when Latvia regained its freedom. Before that, she said, Gaŗezers campers had a weekly ceremony during which they would burn the Communist flag and sing songs of freedom for Latvia.

We'd stand around in a circle holding hands, and we'd just sing and sing and sing, well past bedtime. And that was the one time a lot of the counselors allowed it, because everybody was, like, so emotional. And there's nothing like that now, because there is no—if you want to go to Latvia, go to Latvia (personal communication, June 2011).

There was nothing to fight against anymore, Maruta said.

As for Gaŗezers staffer Ināra, “We come from Riga,” she said—although she was born in Canada. The personal pronoun reveals a strong affiliation with her parents' homeland, but the retired teacher has always been a product of the new world, too. When she is in Canada, she joked, she is Latvian, but when she is in Latvia she is Canadian. As a child, Ināra said, she did not enjoy Latvian school and complained about it enough that her parents let her quit after grade 7. Family, her artwork and her Latvian sorority connections keep her active in the community. She associates a more completely Latvian identity with people of her parents' generation, saying she lacks first-hand perspective on what it meant to be Latvian in their time.

Being from here, it's like, you listen to the parents and listen to the grandparents and get some of this . . . shadowy sense. . . . And that's in

many families. So for a child growing up here, in Canada or in the United States, in one sense it's a brainwash—you know, Communism and all of that. Because we in our daily life, we don't perceive it. You don't. And it's whatever is said to us that we take in. . . . It's like, what the parents say. You know, whatever they drum into you. Whatever they tell, the kids mimic (personal communication, June 2011).

Immersed in Latvian heritage as a young person, Ināra said, she was almost grown before it dawned on her that other groups identify just as strongly with their heritage. On a visit to Riga, she and her mother attended a concert by groups of non-Latvian people living in Latvia. She had never thought about them except in passing, she said.

I think, you know, “too many Russians,” and I know there are some Belarusians, but I never realized how many there were, like in terms of the variety. And how each of them is so proud of their culture! That's exactly us here, or any Latvians in the United States, or in Germany, or in Australia—exactly what we do here, those groups were doing in Latvia. It was such an eye-opener for me. . . . We happen to be Latvian. If we were Ukrainian, or Uzbekistan, or whatever, it's the same for each of our cultures. We're no different (personal communication, June 2011).

As members of displaced communities, it is easy for people to look inward at what happened in their own homelands to bring them to their new places. Sometimes refugees from different countries end up fighting over limited

resources, or animosities from the old world are continued in the new. From a practical standpoint, it might be easiest to adopt the strategy of most of the ethnic minorities who have come to North America over the past 400 years: assimilation, ASAP. For groups making the effort, however, holding onto old-world language and culture can be rewarding in many ways, both for themselves and for the larger societies in which they remain distinctive, contributing to acceptance of and respect for cultural differences. Of the Japanese-Australian HL maintainers she studied, Oriyama (2010) writes:

Many felt proud to be able to speak Japanese, and commented that their peers are impressed with or envious of their Japanese ability. The participants' perception of generally positive attitudes . . . from the wider community may have helped them to form a positive sense of identity" (p. 94).

It's likely that the ethnic Russians and Belarusians Ināra and her mother encountered in Latvia were having a similar experience.

Self-Reported Language Practices

It is interesting to note in parents' and children's self reports of their language practices that while the parents grew up speaking only Latvian with their own parents, the children report that less than 25 percent of them speak only Latvian with their parents. I also wanted to see what other language practices were common and different among the age groups. The reading practices are not as dissimilar as I might have predicted. The question about

reading Latvian-only books for pleasure yielded about 50 percent of adults and 30 percent of youths. Electronic media in Latvian language results are a little under 50 percent for adults and almost 70 percent for youths.

Respondents indicate their difficulties in maintaining their heritage language. The adults' highest three categories, at 60 percent for each, were 1) "People respond in English even when you are speaking to them in Latvian," 2) "Compared to speaking skills, reading and writing skills are weaker," and 3) "Not interested in Latvian books."

The children's highest three categories are 1) 70 percent "Limited opportunities to use Latvian outside home, church, and Latvian class," 2) 65 percent "Compared to speaking skills, reading and writing skills are weaker," and 3) 60 percent "There are/were no Latvian books that are age appropriate and fun," followed closely by "Not interested in Latvian books."

CHAPTER FIVE

CONCLUSION

This study investigated the roles of schooling, family discourse practices and community contact in HLM and identity formation among two groups of North American Latvians, one made up of 49 teenagers at language camp, the other comprising 21 parents and camp staff members, exploring differences and similarities among them by age, gender and self-stated national identity and language proficiency. Previous research on HLM in this community was done by Sanders 12 years before the breakup of the Soviet Union; my study offers a look at current attitudes of adults who have had more than 20 years to live with the changed circumstances of their families' homeland, and at those of youths who have never known Latvia as anything but an independent nation.

Connected to the World

In 1999, Woods found that the ability to communicate and keep close ties with other Latvian Diaspora groups was a significant motivation for Latvian HLM in Melbourne, Australia. Those who fled Latvia after World War II were determined to maintain the language and culture of the old country in a new land so they could return someday. Woods' Latvian Australians did not move back to Latvia after it regained its independence, yet Latvian HLM remained a top priority for many families. My North American Latvians also demonstrate a determination to preserve their Latvian relationships around the world. Very few of them have

moved back to Latvia, although many visit regularly. For them, in effect, the beloved homeland—now partly their own creation—embraces the current state of Latvia as well as those who fled, plus their descendents around the world.

All the North American Latvians who participated in my research indicated that maintaining the language is important for their community; many responded that their Latvian identity would cease to exist without HLM activities such as school, camp and speaking Latvian at home. From the interviews I conducted, it seems likely that parents have been saying that to children for two or three generations. Indeed, the ranks of fluent post-Diaspora Latvian speakers have been thinning since the 1950s; surveys and interviews indicated an intense awareness of that fact. Camps and schools continue, though, and the network that links disparate parts of the worldwide Latvian community remains strong. North American Latvians who do HLM also learn and work in the wider English-speaking community, but alongside their school clothes and business attire are colorful Latvian costumes, all ready for festivals and folk dancing. The community remains distinct and discernible.

My data indicated a connection between self-stated national identity and self-assessment of Latvian proficiency among the youths: Those who identified as Latvian gave themselves higher ratings for proficiency than did those who identified as Latvian American or Latvian Canadian, who in turn gave themselves higher ratings than did those who identified simply as American or Canadian. That correlation did not seem to apply among the adults, two-thirds of whom

gave themselves the highest rating in proficiency, but who were more likely to identify as Latvian American or Latvian Canadian. In terms of gender, men were much more likely to identify simply as Latvian than were women, and on average adults who identified as Latvian averaged slightly lower in self-assessment of proficiency than did Latvian-identified youths, even though most of the adults grew up speaking Latvian at home.

Like Agate Nesaule, author of *A Woman in Amber*, Latvia's original émigrés to North America struggled to maintain a solid identity in their new home. They created their own precious amber in the form of language and traditions passed down to their children, grandchildren, and now great-grandchildren. Their plan to move back to Latvia someday has been transformed: They carry their Latvia with them wherever they go, but at some point their new land became their home, whether they identify as American or Canadian, Latvian American or Latvian Canadian, or simply Latvian.

I am eager to share my thesis with faculty and staff at Garzners, who facilitated my work and expressed interest in seeing the results. Some participants also asked to see the finished paper; they might enjoy reading about their community in aggregate. I will be interested in what they think, because their ideas could help spark further research.

APPENDIX A

TABLES

Table 2A									
<i>Participant Identity and Affective Factors by Group</i>									
Subject	Age	Gender	Prof.	Identity	Name				
					1st	Last	Like	Sound	Friends
Adult Bilinguals									
Davis	50	M	4	LA or LC	10	10	10	0	100%
Aija	47	F	4	LA or LC	10	10	10	0	90%
Nora	48	F	4	LA or LC	0	10	10	0	80%
Marga	51	F	4	LA or LC	0	10	10	0	100%
Rasma	53	F	3	LA or LC	10	10	10	0	100%
Ingrida	51	F	4	LA or LC	10	10	10	10	95%
Ruta	55	F	3	LA or LC	10	10	10	10	100%
Igors	68	M	3	L	10	10	10	10	99%
Sarma	48	F	4	L	10	10	10	10	90%
Mirdza	61	F	2	L	10	10	0	0	50%
Boris	45	M	4	L	10	10	10	0	90%
Baiba	49	F	4	LA or LC	0	0	10	10	100%
Arnis	58	M	4	LA or LC	10	10	10	10	95%
Emilija	49	F	4	LA or LC	10	10	10	0	90%
Asija	49	F	4	L	10	10	10	10	100%
Ivars	53	M	3	LA or LC	10	10	10	10	80%
Olafs	73	M	3	L	10	10	10	0	100%
Kalvis	56	M	3	LA or LC	10	10	10	10	50%
Talivaldis	49	M	4	L	10	10	10	0	90%
Inta	48	F	4	L	10	10	0	0	100%
Georgs	51	M	4	L	10	10	10	0	90%
Average	53		3.6		8.6	9.5	9	4.3	90%

Table 2									
<i>Participant Identity and Affective Factors by Group</i>									
Subject	Age	Gender	Prof	Identity	Name				
					1st	Last	Like	Sound	Friends
Youth Bilinguals									
Eduards	17	M	3	L	10	10	0	0	100%
Girts	15	M	4	LA or LC	10	10	10	10	95%
Filips	16	M	2	LA or LC	10	0	10	10	94%
Karlis	15	M	4	L	10	10	10	0	100%
Nikolajs	16	M	3	L	10	10	10	0	80%
Brigita	16	F	3	LL or CL	10	10	10	10	80%
Māra	16	F	4	L	10	10	10	0	99%
Astrida	16	F	3	LA or LC	10	10	10	0	75%
Ugis	16	M	4	L	10	10	10	10	85%
Gunārs	15	M	3	LA or LC	0	0	10	10	80%
Iveta	15	F	4	L	10	10	10	10	90%
Zubite	16	F	3	L	10	10	10	10	90%
Beatrise	16	F	3	LA or LC	10	10	10	10	95%
Ilona	16	F	4	LA or LC	10	10	10	10	70%
Mikēlis	16	M	3	LA or LC	10	10	10	0	100%
Gatis	17	M	4	L	10	10	10	0	95%
Jazeps	17	M	4	L	10	10	10	0	99%
Anja	16	F	4	L	10	10	10	0	100%
Laila	17	F	4	L	10	10	10	0	100%
Silvija	15	F	4	L	10	10	10	10	95%
Diāna	16	F	4	L	10	10	10	10	100%
Angelika	16	F	3	LA or LC	10	10	10	10	95%
Alise	17	F	3	LA or LC	10	10	10	10	100%
Madalena	16	F	4	A or C	10	0	10	10	100%
Kronvaldis	16	M	4	LA or LC	10	10	10	10	75%
Rolands	16	M	2	A or C	0	10	10	10	100%
Katrīna	16	F	3	LA or LC	10	0	10	0	100%
Evija	19	F	3	L	10	10	10	10	80%
Lize	17	F	3	LL or CL	10	10	10	0	95%
Inguna	17	F	3	A or C	0	0	10	10	98%
Ints	16	M	3	L	10	10	10	10	0%

Jūlijs	16	M	3	L	10	10	10	10	100%
Dain	16	M	3	LA or LC	10	10	10	0	100%
Pēteris	16	M	3	LA or LC	0	0	0	10	100%
Antons	16	M	3	LA or LC	10	10	10	10	100%
Harijs	16	M	3	L	10	10	10	10	100%
Kristīna	17	F	4	LA or LC	10	10	10	10	95%
Mārtiņš	17	M	4	LA or LC	10	10	10	0	100%
Āris	17	M	3	L	10	10	10	10	70%
Modris	17	M	3	LA or LC	10	10	10	10	99%
Janina	17	F	4	LA or LC	10	10	10	10	80%
Kristaps	17	M	3	LA or LC	10	10	10	0	100%
Ludvigs	16	M	3	LA or LC	10	10	0	0	100%
Laima	18	F	3	LA or LC	10	10	10	10	100%
Raimonds	16	M	3	L	10	10	0	0	100%
Toms	16	M	3	L	10	10	0	0	100%
Velna	17	F	3	LA or LC	10	0	0	0	100%
Teodors	16	M	3	L	10	0	0	0	100%
Vilis	15	M	3	LA or LC	10	10	10	10	100%
Average	16.3		3.3		9.2	8.4	8.6	5.9	92%

Identity and Heritage Language Maintenance

Table 1 summarizes the data on background, self-reported Latvian proficiency, language use, and identity factors for each survey participant per age group, and the percentage of Latvian language use with their Latvian parent(s) for each group.

Notes: Parentage^a

LL Latvian only. LNL Latvian and Non-Latvian

Table 1A

Participant Background, Language Use, Latvian Proficiency, and Identity by Group

Subject	Age	Gender	Parent	Lang. Use		Length of	Sibs	Prof		Identity	
				M	F	Schooling		School	Camp		
Youth Bilinguals											
Eduards	17	M	LL	4	4	5	3	0	0	3	L
Girts	15	M	LNL	5	5	5	4	9	12	4	LA or LC
Filips	16	M	LL	2	1	1	2	9	12	2	LA or LC
Karlis	15	M	LL	5	5	5	4	9	12	4	L
Nikolajs	16	M	LL	4	4	4	3	0	14	3	L
Brigita	16	F	LL	4	3	4	3	3	11	3	LL or CL
Māra	16	F	LL	4	4	4	4	9	13	4	L
Astrida	16	F	LL	2	2	2	2	11	8	3	LA or LC
Ugis	16	M	LNL	5	4	5	4	3	12	4	L
Gunārs	15	M	LL	5	2	4	4	0	0	3	LA or LC
Iveta	15	F	LL	3	3	3	2	10	13	4	L
Zubite	16	F	LL	4	2	3	3	11	4	3	L

Beatrise	16	F	LL	2	4	2	3	9	10	3	LA or LC
Ilona	16	F	LL	5	4	4	4	9	12	4	LA or LC
Mīkelis	16	M	LL	2	2	4	2	12	12	3	LA or LC
Gatis	17	M	LL	5	5	5	3	1	7	4	L
Jazeps	17	M	LL	5	5	5	5	12	13	4	L
Anja	16	F	LL	5	5	5	5	13	10	4	L
Laila	17	F	LL	5	5	5	5	13	11	4	L
Silvija	15	F	LL	5	5	5	4	11	12	4	L
Diāna	16	F	LNL	4		2	2	3	13	4	L
Angelika	16	F	LL	5	5	5	3	0	4	3	LA or LC
Alise	17	F	LL	4	4	2	1	9	12	3	LA or LC
Madalena	16	F	LL	5	1	2	3	11	13	4	A or C
Kronvaldis	16	M	LL	4	4	5	2	11	13	4	LA or LC
Rolands	16	M	LNL	2	1	1	1	9	2	2	A or C
Katrīna	16	F	LL	4	1	1	3	9	9	3	LA or LC
Evija	19	F	LL	4	4	4	3	0	13	3	L
Lize*	17	F	LNL	5	4	5	3	9	12	3	LL or CL
Inguna	17	F	LL	5	2	3	2	5	12	3	A or C
Ints	16	M	LL	5	5	5	4	12	12	3	L
Jūlijs	16	M	LL	1	4	2	1	9	6	3	L
Dain	16	M	LL	4	4	2	1	9	12	3	LA or LC
Pēteris	16	M	LL	5	1	1	5	9	11	3	LA or LC
Antons	16	M	LL	3	3	4	4	9	10	3	LA or

											LC
Harijs	16	M	LL	4	3	1	3	9	10	3	L
Kristīna	17	F	LL	4	4	4		9	12	4	LA or LC
Mārtiņš	17	M	LL	5	5	5		9	12	4	LA or LC
Āris	17	M	LL	2	2	2	2	11	14	3	L
Modris	17	M	LL	3	3	3	3	9	3	3	LA or LC
Janina	17	F	LL	5	5	5	3	9	15	4	LA or LC
Kristaps	17	M	LL	4	4	5	3	11	14	3	LA or LC
Ludvigs	16	M	LL	4	4	4	3	12	12	3	LA or LC
Laima	18	F	LL	4	4	3	3	9	3	3	LA or LC
Raimonds	16	M	LL	4	4	5	3	0	13	3	L
Toms	16	M	LL	4	4	4	3	9	12	3	L
Velna	17	F	LL	4	4	3	3	9	12	3	LA or LC
Teodors	16	M	LL	4	4	4	3	9	12	3	L
Vilis	15	M	LL	4	4	3	3	9	10	3	LA or LC
Average	16.3		5-LNL -All five it is mother who is L	4	3.6	3.6	3	7. 8	10. 1	3. 3	

Q. 9

5. Latvian Only
4. Mostly Latvian
3. Latvian and English to the same degree
2. Mostly English
1. English Only

*Lize has an Estonian parent.

Table 1B

Participant Background, Language Use, Latvian Proficiency, and Identity by Group

Subject	Age	Gender	parent	Lang. Use				Length of Schooling		Prof	Identity
				M	F	Pts	Sibs	School	Camp		
Adult Bilinguals											
Davis	50	M	LL	10	10	10	0	8	12	4	LA or LC
Aija	47	F	LL	10	10	10	0	8	12	4	LA or LC
Nora	48	F	LL	10	10	10		7	4	4	LA or LC
Marga	51	F	LL	10	10	10	10	17	12	4	LA or LC
Rasma	53	F	LL	10	8	10		0	3	3	LA or LC
Ingrida	51	F	LL	10	10	10	0	13	5	4	LA or LC
Ruta	55	F	LL	10	10	10	8	13	6	3	LA or LC
Igors	68	M	LL	10	10	10	8	4	0	3	L
Sarma	48	F	LL	10	10	10	8	12	5	4	L
Mirdza	61	F	LL	8	8	10	3	8	5	2	L
Boris	45	M	LL	10	10	8	8	13	4	4	L
Baiba	49	F	LL	8	10	10		12	12	4	LA or LC
Arnis	58	M	LL	10	10	10	0	12	0	4	LA or LC
Emilija	49	F	LL	8	8	10	0	3	3	4	LA or LC
Asija	49	F	LL	8	8	10		12	12	4	L
Ivars	53	M	LL	10	10	10	0	9	5	3	LA or LC
Olafs	73	M	LL	10	10	10	10	5	0	3	L
Kalvis	56	M	LL	10	10	10	5	0	0	3	LA or LC
Talivaldis	49	M	LL	10	10	10	10	13	0	4	L
Inta	48	F	LL	10	10	10	0	11	10	4	L
Georgs	51	M	LL	10	10	10	0	8	5	4	L
Average	53			9.6	9.6	9.9		8.6	10.4	3.6	

Table 3

Subject	Age	Gender	Prof.	challenge
Davis	50	M	4	vocab
Aija	47	F	4	vocab
Nora	48	F	4	vocab
Marga	51	F	4	
Rasma	53	F	3	grammar
Ingrida	51	F	4	grammar
Ruta	55	F	3	vocab
Igors	68	M	3	vocab
Sarma	48	F	4	vocab
Mirdza	61	F	2	grammar
Boris	45	M	4	vocab
Baiba	49	F	4	grammar
Arnis	58	M	4	vocab
Emilija	49	F	4	grammar
Asija	49	F	4	grammar
Ivars	53	M	3	grammar
Olafs	73	M	3	grammar
Kalvis	56	M	3	grammar
Talivaldis	49	M	4	grammar
Inta	48	F	4	vocab
Georgs	51	M	4	vocab
Bendiks	87	M		
Average	54.7		3.6	
Eduards	17	M	3	grammar
Girts	15	M	4	vocab
Filips	16	M	2	grammar
Karlis	15	M	4	Spelling
Nikolajs	16	M	3	grammar
Brigita	16	F	3	grammar
Māra	16	F	4	vocab
Astrida	16	F	3	grammar
Ugis	16	M	4	grammar
Gunārs	15	M	3	vocab
Iveta	15	F	4	grammar
Zubite	16	F	3	grammar

Beatrise	16	F	3	grammar
Ilona	16	F	4	grammar
Miķelis	16	M	3	vocab
Gatis	17	M	4	vocab
Jazeps	17	M	4	vocab
Anja	16	F	4	Spelling
Laila	17	F	4	nothing
Silvija	15	F	4	grammar
Diāna	16	F	4	grammar
Angelika	16	F	3	grammar
Alise	17	F	3	vocab
Madalena	16	F	4	grammar
Kronvaldis	16	M	4	grammar
Rolands	16	M	2	grammar
Katrīna	16	F	3	grammar
Evija	19	F	3	grammar
Lize	17	F	3	vocab
Inguna	17	F	3	vocab
Ints	16	M	3	vocab
Jūlijs	16	M	3	grammar
Dain	16	M	3	vocab
Pēteris	16	M	3	grammar
Antons	16	M	3	grammar
Harijs	16	M	3	vocab
Kristīna	17	F	4	vocab
Mārtiņš	17	M	4	vocab
Āris	17	M	3	grammar
Modris	17	M	3	grammar
Janina	17	F	4	grammar
Kristaps	17	M	3	grammar
Ludvigs	16	M	3	grammar
Laima	18	F	3	grammar
Raimonds	16	M	3	grammar
Toms	16	M	3	grammar
Velna	17	F	3	grammar
Teodors	16	M	3	grammar
Vilis	15	M	3	grammar
Average	16.3		3.3	

Parents' Language Practices (n=22)

<i>Domain</i>	<i>Latvian only</i>	<i>Mostly Latvian</i>	<i>Latvian and English to the same degree</i>	<i>Mostly English</i>	<i>English only</i>
What parents spoke to each other	21	1			
What parents spoke to me	19.5		1.5		
What language I speak to my children	5	6	2	2	7
Reading books for pleasure	10	-	-	-	-
Reading books church/other	10	-	-	-	-
Reading newspapers	22	-	-	-	-
Using Electronic Media	10	-	-	-	-

Table 5 Children's language practices (n=49)

<i>Domain</i>	<i>Latvian only</i>	<i>Mostly Latvian</i>	<i>Latvian and English to the same degree</i>	<i>Mostly English</i>	<i>English only</i>
Talking to father	11	21	5	6	5
Talking to mother	18	21	1	6	3
Talking to siblings	4	9	4	8	22
Reading books for pleasure	15				
Reading books church/other	22				
Reading newspapers	31				
Using Electronic Media	33				

Table 6 Adults report difficulties developing Latvian language
n=22

<i>Statements</i>	YES	NO
People respond in English even when you are speaking to them in Latvian	13	9
Your family members' Latvian proficiency is low	7	15
Conversations at home are mostly in English.	10	12
Vocabulary limited to home and immediate environment.	10	12
Compared to speaking skills, reading and writing skills are weaker.	13	8
Not interested in Latvian books.	13	8
There are/were no Latvian books that are age appropriate and fun.	9	13
I have few friends who are Latvian to talk with.	4	18
Limited opportunities to socialize with families where one or both of the parents are Latvian.	8	14
Limited opportunities to use Latvian outside home, church, and Latvian class.	12	10
Other (please explain)		
None		

Table 7 Children report difficulties developing Latvian language n=49

<i>Statements</i>	YES	NO
People respond in English even when you are speaking to them in Latvian	23	26
Your family members' Latvian proficiency is low	3	46
Conversations at home are mostly in English.	14	25
Vocabulary limited to home and immediate environment.	27	22
Compared to speaking skills, reading and writing skills are weaker.	32	17
Not interested in Latvian books.	27	22
There are/were no Latvian books that are age appropriate and fun.	29	20
I have few friends who are Latvian to talk with.	12	37
Limited opportunities to socialize with families where one or both of the parents are Latvian.	12	37
Limited opportunities to use Latvian outside home, church, and Latvian class.	34	15
Other (please explain)		
None		

APPENDIX B
INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL



Academic Affairs
Office of Academic Research • Institutional Review Board

June 22, 2011

Ms. Margaret J. Stepe
c/o: Prof. Caroline Vickers
Department of English
California State University
5500 University Parkway
San Bernardino, California 92407

CSUSB
INSTITUTIONAL
REVIEW BOARD
Full Board Review
IRB# 10100
Status
APPROVED

Dear Ms. Stepe:

Your application to use human subjects, titled "American Latvians Keeping Cultural Connections Alive through Heritage Language Learning" has been reviewed and approved by the Institutional Review Board (IRB). The attached informed consent document has been stamped and signed by the IRB chairperson. All subsequent copies used must be this officially approved version. A change in your informed consent (no matter how minor the change) requires resubmission of your protocol as amended. **Your application is approved for one year from June 22, 2011 through June 21, 2012. One month prior to the approval end date you need to file for a renewal if you have not completed your research. See additional requirements (Items 1 – 4) of your approval below.**

Your responsibilities as the researcher/investigator reporting to the IRB Committee include the following 4 requirements as mandated by the Code of Federal Regulations 45 CFR 46 listed below. Please note that the protocol change form and renewal form are located on the IRB website under the forms menu. Failure to notify the IRB of the above may result in disciplinary action. You are required to keep copies of the informed consent forms and data for at least three years.

- 1) **Submit a protocol change form if any changes (no matter how minor) are made in your research prospectus/protocol for review and approval of the IRB before implemented in your research.**
- 2) **If any unanticipated/adverse events are experienced by subjects during your research,**
- 3) **Too renew your protocol one month prior to the protocols end date,**
- 4) **When your project has ended by emailing the IRB Coordinator/Compliance Analyst.**

The CSUSB IRB has not evaluated your proposal for scientific merit, except to weigh the risk to the human participants and the aspects of the proposal related to potential risk and benefit. This approval notice does not replace any departmental or additional approvals which may be required.

If you have any questions regarding the IRB decision, please contact Michael Gillespie, IRB Compliance Coordinator. Mr. Michael Gillespie can be reached by phone at (909) 537-7588, by fax at (909) 537-7028, or by email at mgillespie@csusb.edu. Please include your application approval identification number (listed at the top) in all correspondence.

Best of luck with your research.

Sincerely,

Sharon Ward, Ph.D., Chair
Institutional Review Board

SW/mg

cc: Prof. Caroline Vickers, Department of English

909.537.7588 • fax: 909.537.7028 • <http://irb.csusb.edu/>
5500 UNIVERSITY PARKWAY, SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92407-2393

The California State University • Bakersfield • Channel Islands • Chico • Dominguez Hills • East Bay • Fresno • Fullerton • Humboldt • Long Beach • Los Angeles
Maritime Academy • Monterey Bay • Northridge • Pomona • Sacramento • San Bernardino • San Diego • San Francisco • San Jose • San Luis Obispo • San Marcos • Sonoma • Stanislaus

APPENDIX C

LETTER FROM CAMP DIRECTOR



GAREZERS **Latviešu centrs**

57732 Lone Tree Road
Three Rivers, MI 49093-9549

garezers@garezers.org
www.garezers.org

Latvian Center

Office: (269) 244-5441
Fax: (269) 244-8380

May 27, 2011

To Whom It May Concern:

The Latvian Center Garezers gives permission to Mrs. Peggy Stepe to conduct interviews with the kids and their parents on a project for her studies in Applied Linguistics. This project would look at what happens when people learn a second language--specifically a heritage language--and what knowledge, affiliation they are gaining.

We will work with our program directors and the parents to notify them of the project at time of registration. If there are any release forms needed for the parents, counselors, etc to sign, we would appreciate that they would be made available prior to the interviews.

Finally, we would appreciate having the results of the project made available to us as we are continually looking at the evolution of our cultural identity.

Regards,

Andrejs Dumpis
Executive Director

APPENDIX D

CONSENT FORMS

**American Latvians Keeping Cultural Connections Alive
Through Heritage Language Learning
Parent Consent Form**

The study in which your child is being invited to participate is designed to investigate how Latvian heritage-language camps, schools and community programs help American families maintain strong bonds with Latvian language and culture. This study is being conducted by **Margaret (Peggy) Stepe**, a graduate student in the department of English. This study has been approved by the Institutional Review Board, California State University, San Bernardino.

In this study, your child will be asked to allow the researcher to learn about his/her experiences at a Latvian heritage-language school, camp or program. I am inviting him/her to participate in the following: Providing detailed answers to a questionnaire about his/her experiences with Latvian heritage-language and cultural learning (about 45 minutes.)

The questionnaires will be held in the strictest of confidence by the researcher. Your child's name will not be reported with responses, as the researcher will use a number to refer to him/her. The questionnaires will be kept in a locked briefcase and then a locked file cabinet in my home in California, for three years, at which time I will shred them.

Your child's participation in this study is totally voluntary. He/she is free to answer some questions and not others, or to withdraw at any time during this study without penalty. Long-range risks are minimal but may include psychological discomfort at being asked personal questions about family. Examples of questions are: "What languages do you speak with your brothers and sisters, and parents?" and "What do you say to others when they ask you, in terms of ethnicity, nationality..." "What are you?" Does it depend who is asking?" I also ask about whether or not their non-Latvian friends know they're Latvian, and whether they like their name.

The benefits of this research project will probably not impact participants, but will explore a topic of interest to students of applied linguistics, and the Garezers Camp organization has requested that I share my completed report because they will benefit from the aggregate research.

If you have any questions or concerns about this study, please feel free to ask me now or use the contact information at the bottom of this form. I will provide you a copy of this form to keep for yourself.

By signing this consent form, I acknowledge that I have been informed of, and that I understand, the nature and purpose of this study, and I freely consent to participate. I also acknowledge that I am at least **AT LEAST 18 YEARS OF AGE**.

Parent/Guardian Signature: _____ **Today's date:** _____

Print Parent/Guardian Name: _____

For questions regarding this project you may contact the faculty advisor at California State University, San Bernardino, Caroline Vickers, PhD, at 909-537-5684, cwickers@csusb.edu. Or the researcher, Margaret (Peggy) Stepe at 951-565-0865 or Margaret.stepe@verizon.net

909.537.5824 • fax: 909.537.7086 • <http://english.csusb.edu/>

5500 UNIVERSITY PARKWAY, SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92407-2393

The California State University • Bakersfield • Channel Islands • Chico • Dominguez Hills • East Bay • Fresno • Fullerton • Humboldt • Long Beach • Los Angeles
 Maritime Academy • Monterey Bay • Northridge • Pomona • Sacramento • San Bernardino • San Diego • San Francisco • San Jose • San Luis Obispo • San Marcos • Sonoma • Stanislaus



CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, SAN BERNARDINO

Department of English

INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD COMMITTEE

APPROVED 06/22/11 VOID AFTER 06/21/12

IRB# 10100

CHAIR Sharon A. Ward, Ph.D.

American Latvians Keeping Cultural Connections Alive Through Heritage Language Learning Adult Consent Form

The study in which you are being asked to participate is designed to investigate how Latvian heritage-language camps, schools and community programs help American families maintain strong bonds with Latvian language and culture. This study is being conducted by **Margaret (Peggy) Stepe**, a graduate student in the department of **English**. This study has been approved by the Institutional Review Board, California State University, San Bernardino.

In this study, you are asked to allow researchers to learn about your experiences at a Latvian heritage-language school, camp or program, or as a parent/family member of an enrolled child. I am inviting you to participate in the following: Providing detailed answers to a questionnaire about your experiences with Latvian heritage-language and cultural learning (about 45 minutes.)

The questionnaires will be held in the strictest of confidence by the researcher. Your name will not be reported with responses, as the researcher will use a number to refer to you. The questionnaires will be kept in a locked briefcase and then a locked file cabinet in my home in California, for three years, at which time I will shred them.

Your participation in this study is totally voluntary. You are free to answer some questions and not others, or to withdraw at any time during this study without penalty. Long-range risks are minimal but may include psychological discomfort at being asked personal questions about your family. Examples of questions are: "What languages do you speak with your children?" and "What do you say to others when they ask you, in terms of ethnicity, nationality... "What are you?" Does it depend who is asking?" There is also a line of questioning dealing with your feelings about the financial commitment you have made to your children's Latvian education.

The benefits of this research project will probably not impact participants, but will explore a topic of interest to students of applied linguistics, and the Garezers Camp organization has requested that I share my completed report because they will benefit from the aggregate research.

If you have any questions or concerns about this study, please feel free to ask me now or use the contact information at the bottom of this form. I will provide you a copy of this form to keep for yourself.

By signing this consent form, you acknowledge that you have been informed of, and that you understand, the nature and purpose of this study, and you freely consent to participate. you also acknowledge that you are **AT LEAST 18 YEARS OF AGE**.

Signature: _____

Today's date: _____

Print Name: _____

For questions regarding this project you may contact the faculty advisor at California State University, San Bernardino, Caroline Vickers, PhD, at 909-537-5684, cvickers@csusb.edu. Or the researcher, Margaret (Peggy) Stepe at 951-565-0865 or 909-537-5624 • fax: 909-537-7086 • <http://english.csusb.edu/>

5500 UNIVERSITY PARKWAY, SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92407-2393

The California State University • Bakersfield • Channel Islands • Chico • Dominguez Hills • East Bay • Fresno • Fullerton • Humboldt • Long Beach • Los Angeles
Maritime Academy • Monterey Bay • Northridge • Pomona • Sacramento • San Bernardino • San Diego • San Francisco • San Jose • San Luis Obispo • San Marcos • Sonoma • Stanislaus

**American Latvians Keeping Cultural Connections Alive
Through Heritage Language Learning
Staff Member Consent Form**

The study in which you are being asked to participate is designed to investigate how Latvian heritage-language camps, schools and community programs help American families maintain strong bonds with Latvian language and culture. This study is being conducted by **Margaret (Peggy) Stepe**, a graduate student in the department of English. This study has been approved by the Institutional Review Board, California State University, San Bernardino.

In this study, you are asked to allow researchers to learn about your experience as a staff member at a Latvian heritage-language school, camp or program. You may be asked to participate in the following:

An audio-taped interview (up to one hour and fifteen minutes.) This is strictly for research purposes and in no way an evaluation of your performance. No personal information I collect from you will not be passed on to your supervisors. Examples of questions I will ask you are about what you predict for future of Latvian Language Education in North America, and what experiences your family members may have gone through in their journey to North American and their experiences as Latvian speakers, and Latvian people.

The audio recording of your interview will be held in the strictest of confidence by the researcher. Your name will not be reported with your responses; I will use a number to refer to you.

Your participation in this study is totally voluntary. You are free not to answer any questions and to withdraw at any time during this study without penalty. Participating or declining to participate will have no effect with regard to your status at camp, as my research is in no way connected with Garezers Camp.

Long-range risks to you are minimal but may include psychological discomfort at being audio-taped or by answering questions about family history and other personal information.

If you have any questions or concerns about this study, ask me now, or feel free to contact my advisor or myself at contact information listed below.

By signing this consent form, you acknowledge that you have been informed of, and that you understand, the nature and purpose of this study, and you freely consent to participate. You also acknowledge that you are **AT LEAST 18 YEARS OF AGE**.

I understand that this interview will be audio recorded _____ (Initials).

I understand that the audio transcripts can be used in my research presentations and classrooms _____ (Initials).

Signature: _____

Today's date: _____

Print Name: _____

For questions regarding this project you may contact the faculty advisor at California State University, San Bernardino, Caroline Vickers, PhD, at 909-537-5684, cvickers@csusb.edu. Or the researcher, Margaret (Peggy) Stepe at 951-565-0865 or

909.537.5824 • fax: 909.537.7086 • <http://english.csusb.edu/>

5500 UNIVERSITY PARKWAY, SAN BERNARDINO, CA 92407-2393

The California State University • Bakersfield • Channel Islands • Chico • Dominguez Hills • East Bay • Fresno • Fullerton • Humboldt • Long Beach • Los Angeles
Maritime Academy • Monterey Bay • Northridge • Pomona • Sacramento • San Bernardino • San Diego • San Francisco • San Jose • San Luis Obispo • San Marcos • Sonoma • Stanislaus

**American Latvians Keeping Cultural Connections Alive
Through Heritage Language Learning
Child Assent Form**

I am inviting you to help me find out how Latvian heritage-language camps, schools and community programs help families keep close to Latvian language and culture. My name is Peggy, and I'm working on my Master's degree in the English at California State University, San Bernardino.

If you say yes, I'll ask you to fill out a form about what and how you have learned, and your feelings about being Latvian and American. I will not use your name. You don't have to do this and your saying yes or no will not affect your stay here at camp. You can change your mind even after you start and you don't have to answer all the questions if you don't want to. This should take about 30 minutes.

Here are sample questions to give you an idea of what this is about: "What languages do you speak with your brothers and sisters, and parents?" and "What do you say to others if they ask you, ... "What are you?" There are also questions about whether your non-Latvian friends knows you're Latvian, and if you like your name.

If you have any questions or concerns about this study, ask me now or at any time.

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, SAN BERNARDINO
INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD COMMITTEE
APPROVED 06/22/11 VOID AFTER 06/21/12
IRB# 10100 CHAIR Annamaria Ubald, Ph.D.

APPENDIX E
QUESTIONNAIRE

Latvian Heritage Language/Culture Questionnaire

(Questionnaire developed by Margaret Joy Stepe, modeled after Oriyami 2010).

The purpose of this questionnaire is for me to obtain data to use on a report I am doing on Latvian language maintenance in the United States. Your careful answers will aid me in my research. This survey has been written to accommodate people of all ages (grandparents, parents, other adults, and children ages 12 and over.) Please answer all answers that apply to you, and leave blank those that do not. When your choice is Y or N, circle one.

Today's Date: _____

Background and Identity

1. Your Age: _____
2. Where do you live? _____
3. Birthplace: _____
4. Number of years in Latvian school: _____ ex: K-10
5. Number of years attending Latvian summer camp: _____
6. # siblings and ages _____
7. Where did/do your grandparents live? Please circle the corresponding letter:

Your mother's parents

- a. Latvia
- b. United States
- c. Other

Your father's parents

- a. Latvia
- b. United States
- c. other

8. Do you visit Latvia? Y N If so, how often? _____
9. Who in your family came from Latvia? (their relation to you, not their names. May list multiple individuals, e.g. grandparents, parents) and what year(s) if you know?

10. What languages did/do they speak?

11. Is your first name Latvian? Y N

12. Is your last name Latvian? Y N

13. Do you like your name? Y N

14. Do you always pronounce it “correctly”? Y N

15. Do you correct others if they do not pronounce it correctly? Y N

16. If you are a parent, are your children’s names Latvian in origin? Y N

17. What, is anything special, went into the naming process?

18. Which sentence best describes you, in your opinion?

- a. I am Latvian.
- b. I am American.
- c. I am Latvian-American.
- d. I am American-Latvian.
- e. I am a Latvian in exile.
- f. Other _____

19. What do you say to others when they ask you, in terms of ethnicity, nationality...

“What are you?” Does it depend who is asking?

20. Your parents are a) both Latvian or b) one is Latvian. (if b, which parent is Latvian?)

Language

1. What would you consider your level of Latvian language proficiency?
 - a. Excellent
 - b. Good
 - c. Fair
 - d. Beginner

2. What is/was your biggest challenge learning Latvian?
 - a. Grammar
 - b. Vocabulary
 - c. Spelling
 - d. Pronunciation

3. What percentage of your non-Latvian friends know you speak Latvian? _____
4. How do you feel when you make a mistake while speaking Latvian?

5. Why should/shouldn't American-Latvians and their descendants learn Latvian?

6. What language does your Latvian parent use to speak with you?
- a. Latvian only
 - b. Mostly Latvian
 - c. English only
 - d. Mostly English
 - e. Latvian and English to the same degree
 - f. Other (_____)
7. What language do you use to speak to your parents?

Mother

- a. Latvian only
- b. Mostly Latvian
- c. English only
- d. Mostly English
- e. Latvian and English to the same degree
- f. Other (_____)

Father

- a. Latvian only
- b. Mostly Latvian
- c. English only
- d. Mostly English
- e. Latvian and English to the same degree
- f. Other (_____)

8. What language do you use to speak with your children?
- a. Latvian only
 - b. Mostly Latvian
 - c. English only
 - d. Mostly English
 - e. Latvian and English to the same degree
 - f. Other (_____)

9. What language do/did your parents use to speak with *each other*?
- a. Latvian only
 - b. Mostly Latvian
 - c. English only
 - d. Mostly English
 - e. Latvian and English to the same degree
 - f. Other (_____)
10. What language did/do you use to speak with your brothers and sisters?
- a. Latvian only
 - b. Mostly Latvian
 - c. English only
 - d. Mostly English
 - e. Latvian and English to the same degree
 - f. Other (_____)
11. Do you read Latvian School or church-assigned materials?
- a. Newspapers (ex.)
 - b. Books (ex.)
 - c. Magazines (ex.)
 - d. Internet (please specify_____)
 - e. Other(please specify_____)
 - f. No
12. How often do you read those resources mentioned above?
- a. Every day
 - b. 2 or three times a week
 - c. Once a week
 - d. Once a month
 - e. Other (please specify_____)
 - f. Zero times
13. Do you read Latvian materials other than church or school-assigned?
- a. Newspapers (ex.)

- b. Books (ex.)
- c. Magazines (ex.)
- d. Internet (please specify_____)
- e. Other(please specify_____)
- f. No

14. How often do you read those resources mentioned above?

- a. Every day
- b. 2 or three times a week
- c. Once a week
- d. Once a month
- e. Other (please specify_____)
- f. Zero times

15. Do you watch TV programs (including DVD/videos) in Latvian? How often per month?

- a. Every day
- b. 2 or three times a week
- c. Once a week
- d. Once a month
- e. Other (please specify_____)
- f. No

16. Do you watch TV programs (including DVD/videos) in Latvian? How often per month?

- a. Every day
- b. 2 or three times a week
- c. Once a week
- d. Once a month
- e. Other (please specify_____)
- f. Zero times

17. Do you use entertainment items that require Latvian in order to use them? How often per month?

- a. Latvian website 1 2 3 4 5 or other
- b. Computer games 1 2 3 4 5 or other
- c. Comic books 1 2 3 4 5 or other
- d. Social website, e-mail 1 2 3 4 5 or other
- e. CDs 1 2 3 4 5 or other
- f. YouTube video clips 1 2 3 4 5 or other
- g. Skype 1 2 3 4 5 or other
- h. No

18. What difficulties do/did you face in developing your Latvian language? Please circle applicable items.

- a. People respond in English even when you are speaking to them in Latvian. Y N
- b. Your family members' Latvian proficiency is low. Y N
- c. Conversations at home are mostly in English. Y N
- d. Vocabulary limited to home and immediate environment. Y N
- e. Compared to speaking skills, reading and writing skills are weaker. Y N
- f. Not interested in Latvian books. Y N
- g. There are/were no Latvian books that are age appropriate and fun. Y N
- h. I have few friends who are Latvian to talk with. Y N
- i. Limited opportunities to socialize with families where one or both of the parents are Latvian. Y N
- j. Limited opportunities to use Latvian outside home, church, and Latvian class. Y N
- k. Other (please explain)
- l. None

19. How do you feel about Latvian-only classes and not being allowed to communicate in English?

20. Why do you think studying Latvian is important to you? (Circle one or more.)
- a. I can communicate better in Latvian than English with certain family members. Y N
 - b. To understand Latvian people and culture, and to pass this knowledge on to my children in the future. Y N
 - c. I would like to better understand my Latvian parent or grandparent and what he/she has learned in Latvian. Y N
 - d. Latvian proficiency may be an advantage to me later for employment. Y N
 - e. Other (Please specify.)
21. Do you think developing your reading and writing skills in Latvian is important?
Y N
Why or why not?
22. Is there anything else you would like to add about you and Latvian (language, culture, people, etc.)?

Investment

1. Circle one. The amount of money I spend on my children's Latvian education is: (and if you are a child, answer what you think):
- a. Very expensive. They cannot participate as often as I'd like.
 - b. Expensive
 - c. Affordable
 - d. Money is not a factor.
 - e. Other, please specify

2. Where would you or your child spend Sundays if it were not for Latvian school (if applicable)?

3. Where would you or your child spend the summer if it were not for Garezers summer camp?

Cultural Activities

1. Do you own your own Latvian folk costumes? Y N
2. Besides camp, what other specific Latvian cultural activities do you participate in?

3. How far from home have you travelled to participate in Latvian cultural activities? [# miles or locations(s)]

4. How often do you travel away from home for more than a day to participate in Latvian cultural activities.
 - a. Once a week.
 - b. Once a month.
 - c. Twice a year.
 - d. Once a year.
 - e. Other (please specify)
 - f. Zero Times

APPENDIX F
INTERVIEW

Instrument: Interview Protocol American Latvian Garezers Camp Facilitators

My Opening Script: “Thanks for agreeing to this interview, and if you don’t mind, I’d like to start the audio recorder so I can transcribe our discussion later. The audio recording will not be made available to anyone else and I will destroy it once I have transcribed the data. I will keep the recording locked up and will destroy it in three years. I will not use your name in the transcription or report. My study is about American Latvians and Latvian Language and culture maintenance and preservation in North America. I specifically would like to learn about the use of Latvian language supplemental schools and camps over the past 50-60 years, but any background and historical information you would like to share would also be very helpful. The information I obtain from you and others will go into my report. You are welcome to a copy of my paper once it is done. This interview will probably take about an hour, but may, with your permission, take up to two. Any time you want me to stop the tape, I will. Ready?”

Biographical Information

- Age
- Gender
- Role in camp
- Country of Birth
- Informant or their parents’ year(s) of entry into the United States or Canada
- Route of Entry and story of departure from Latvia
- Story of first years in the United States or Canada
- How they felt about Latvia being part of USSR
- How they felt about likelihood of Latvia regaining independence at different points between 1945 and 1991
- How they felt about Latvia becoming free in 1991
- Role in Latvian Community/Camp/School in preserving Latvian language
- How Latvian language and Latvian culture are intertwined
- Why Latvian identity is important
- What they predict for future of Latvian Language Education in North America

- How they compare the culture in Latvia now to culture of American Latvians
 - How they compare the language in Latvia now to the language used by American Latvians
 - How do the current American Latvian kids compare to those of the 50's, 60's, and so on, in terms of language use and cultural identity
- And any other questions that may arise based on previous answers...

APPENDIX G
CAMP FLYER



CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, SAN BERNARDINO
INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD COMMITTEE

APPROVED 06/22/11 VOID AFTER 06/30/12

IRB# 10100 CHAIR *Sharon Ward, Ph.D.*

Help me learn about Latvian Language and Culture in North America.

I am working on some research about heritage language and culture learning. I need volunteers to fill out a confidential questionnaire about language so I can use the data I gather for my project. It'll take about 30 minutes to complete, and it is for parents and kids 12 and over. It should be thought-provoking and fun! For more information about the study, ask me! Paldies!

This research has been approved by California State University, San Bernardino Institutional Review Board for IRB: _____

PEGGY STEPE, ENGLISH MA STUDENT, CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, SAN BERNARDINO

REFERENCES

- Alba, R., et al. (2002) Only English by the third generation? Loss and preservation of the mother tongue among the grandchildren of contemporary immigrants. *Demography* 39(3), 467-84.
- Bhatt, R.M. (2008). In other words: Language mixing, identity representations, and third space. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 12 (2), 177-200.
- Bradshaw, J. (2006) Parent and Child Perspectives on Greek Language Education in Australia. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 180, 43-54.
- Canagarajah, S. (2007). Lingua franca English, multilingual communities, and language acquisition. *The Modern Language Journal*, 91, 923-939.
- Cook, V. (1999). Going beyond the native speaker in language teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, 33(2), 185-209.
- Dressler, R. (2010) There is no space for being German: Portraits of willing and reluctant heritage language learners of German. *Heritage Language Journal* 7 (2), 1-21.
- Guardado, M. (2010) Heritage language development: Preserving a mythic past or envisioning the future of Canadian identity? *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education* 9(5), 329-346.
- Hornberger, N. (2006). Voice and biliteracy in indigenous language revitalization: Contentious educational practices in Quechua, Guarani, and Maori contexts. *Language, Identity, and Education*, 5(4), 277-292.

- Kasekamp, A. (2010). *A history of the Baltic states*. Houndsmill, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Mallory, J. P., & Dearborn, F. (Eds.). (1997). *Encyclopedia of Indo-European culture*. London: Fitzroy Dearborn.
- Meija, S. D. (2005). *Latvians in Michigan*. East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University Press.
- Messing, J. (2007). Ideologies of public and private uses of language in Tlaxcala, Mexico. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 187(188), 211-227.
- Millward, C. M. (1996). *A biography of the English language*. Fort Worth, Tex.: Harcourt Brace College Publishers.
- Moderresi, Y. (2001) The Iranian community in the United States and the maintenance of Persian. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 148(1), 93-115.
- Norton, B. (2000). *Identity and language learning: gender, ethnicity and educational change*. Essex: Pearson Education Ltd.
- Oriyama, K. (2010). Heritage language maintenance and Japanese identity formation: What role can schooling and ethnic community contact play? *Heritage Language Journal* 7(2), 76-111.
- Otcu, B. (2010) Heritage language maintenance and cultural identity formation: The case of a Turkish Saturday school in New York City. *Heritage Language Journal* 7(2), 112-137.

- Park, S., & Mela Sarkar (2011). Parents' attitudes toward heritage language maintenance for their children and their efforts to help their children maintain the heritage language: A case study of Korean-Canadian immigrants. *Language, Culture and Curriculum* 20(3), 223-235.
- Pavlenko, A. (2005). *Emotions and multilingualism*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Pavlenko, A. (2007). Autobiographic narratives as data in Applied Linguistics. *Applied Linguistics*, 28 (2), 163-188.
- Pollock, A. C., & Reken, R. E. V. (2011). *Third culture kids, growing up among worlds*. Nicholas Brealey Publishing.
- Romaine, S. (2006). Planning for the survival of linguistic diversity. *Language Policy*, 5, 441-473.
- Sanders, Z. (1979). Latvian education in the United States: Antecedents and development of supplementary schools. *The Journal of Ethnic Studies*, 7(1), 31-42.
- Schwartz, M. (2008). Exploring the relationship between family language policy and heritage language knowledge among second generation Russian-Jewish immigrants in Israel. *Journal of Multilingual & Multicultural Development*, 29(5), 400-418.
- Stafecka, A. (2009). Latvian in Siberia: The present and prospects. *Dialectologia et Geolinguistica*, 2007(16), 97-107.

- Talmy, S. (2011). The interview as collaborative achievement: Interaction, identity, and ideology in a speech event. *Applied Linguistics*, 32(1), 25-42.
- Woods, A. (1999). Latvian language maintenance in Melbourne: a "core value" approach. *Monash University Linguistics Papers*, 2(1), 33-44.